

The name of the firm is Rutherford, Jacobs, Cavalero, and Dietrich. Mr. Cavalero is one of the best water lawyers in the State of California. He is a thoroughly ethical, capable, successful member of the bar of California.

These are three typical examples of what the Italians are in our area. Also, among them we have some of the finest vegetable crops to be found anywhere. The Italian gardeners of San Joaquin County, and the Italian gardeners of Lodi, Calif., have an organization and once a year they have a great picnic. The output of agriculture crops by these groups staggers the imagination, and it is one of the things that has helped make San Joaquin County, the fifth county in the point of dollar value of their crops in the entire Nation. Frequently I get things from them, such as asparagus, peaches, cherries, and so forth that I distribute to the Members of the House.

This all leads me to say why it is not possible to give the home country of these remarkable persons a little better opportunity to send people to America to occupy the spaces which are not taken by other nationalities. We must look further still to understand really how disappointed the American-Italian feels by virtue of some of the provisions of this law.

I frequently listen to the TV, and I am especially interested in hearing tuneful songs sung by people that know how to do it. One of my favorites is Perry Como. He is a remarkable individual. Just looking at him one could tell that he was modest and kind, as well as extremely capable in his chosen field of endeavor. He is merely symbolic of many others in all fields of endeavor in our life, many of whom were immigrants.

In the long span of history, I doubt if there is any country in the world that has contributed as much as Italy. They

contributed Christianity, law, invention, science, architecture. A study of their past shows that in practically every century they have played a dominant part since long before the Christian era in making contributions to mankind. Therefore, I am hoping that the bill, which I have and which a number of other colleagues have, will be given serious consideration to the end that the unfortunate situation in which Italy finds itself, due largely to a mad dictator who domineered and almost ruined the entire nation, makes their population situation that much more difficult. Mussolini could have had a place in history as one of the great men of this era. He had an empire in Africa, which I have visited where he could put his excess population, but he threw it all away in his frenzied demand for political power and domination.

We must consider many of the cultural things that Italians have contributed to the world. Italian artists have contributed their experience and creative talents to the construction and decoration of buildings for monarchs and religious communities since Carolingian times. Later, the famous masters of Como and campione participated in creating cathedrals in Spain, France, Germany, and Hungary; and the Roman Piero Oderisi of the Cosmati school, built the two earliest tombs destined for English Kings—Edward I and Henry III—in Westminster Abbey, in the 14th century. During this century, Italian artists participated in building the Papal Palace of Avignon, and frescoed it; among these artists, the great Sienese Simone Martini was outstanding. Others were in France and Bohemia at this time, and a follower of Giovanni Pisano built the Mausoleum of Saint Eulalia in the cathedral of Barcelona. Later, Italian artists succeeded in replacing the Gothic style

throughout Europe with Renaissance classics. Much more could be said about the influence of these artists. Another group of artists and architects decorated the Chateau of Fontainebleau magnificently, and made of it a model of style, and a school for future French art.

In the 17th century, the celebrated Taj Mahal of Agra, one of the marvels of Indian architecture was built by the Venetian Girolamo Veronese with craftsmen he brought with him.

Italian explorers like Marco Polo unlocked unknown parts of the world.

Marconi discovered wireless telegraphy. An early Italian scientist, Leonardo da Vinci—1452-1519—who was also a sculptor and artist and painter predicted that some day motive power would propel machines in the air to vie with the birds. In the First World War the Italians built Capronis and other models of planes that were used in the prosecution of the war. The author of this statement served in France with Fiorello La Guardia at a French field where we both were learning to fly Nieuports and other French planes. Fiorello was sent to Italy because of his knowledge of the Italian language and I learned that he flew some Capronis in combat on the Italian front.

Italian painters decorated the Capitol Building where we hold our sessions of the House of Representatives and the United States Senate holds their sessions.

We certainly must recognize that Italy, the nation, has made tremendous contributions during the long period of its existence.

We should not discard or ignore these tremendous contributions in every field of endeavor because perchance a few bad men of Italian birth have become criminals or gone sour and disgraced their native land by their un-Christian-like conduct.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 9, 1956

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord and Master of us all, midst the tumult of these earth-shaking days with all their angry fury, we come to this shrine of Thy grace seeking the unshaken assurance of those whose minds are stayed on Thee. At this altar of prayer in the radiant afterglow of Easter, with its thrilling message of the risen life, steady us with the realization that back of all the dark tragedy now plaguing the world there is the permanent good of Thy purpose for all mankind, in which we may believe and to which we must be loyal if life is to be saved from frustration at last.

And so, returning to the pressing problems of state, we beseech Thee, empower these servants of the Nation's welfare to bring to their waiting tasks minds to be illumined with kindling thoughts that flame for Thee and for all Thy children, lips to be touched by the burning coals of Thy cleansing that Thou mayest speak through them, wills that glow

with holy zeal to do Thy will, and eyes that may see the invisible with the far look of a faith in things that shall abide beyond our earthly years. And so we pray that Thou wilt direct, control, suggest, this day, all we design or do or say. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 29, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of March 29, 1956, the following message from the House was received by the Secretary of the Senate:

On March 30, 1956:

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 101. An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens;

S. 117. An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens;

S. 213. An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens and to cancel deportation proceedings in the cases of certain aliens;

S. 315. An act to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

S. 396. An act to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens;

S. 500. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes;

S. 663. An act for the relief of William T. Collins (Vasilios T. Buzunis);

S. 963. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 1242. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 1289. An act to establish a domestic relations branch in the municipal court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1667. An act for the relief of Lieselotte Boehme;

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress;

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of

the class other than Members of Congress; and

S. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 28, 1956, the following reports of committees were submitted:

On April 2, 1956:

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 4909. A bill relative to the consolidation of the National Tax Association, a corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, with the Tax Institute, Inc., a corporation organized under the membership-corporations law of the State of New York, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the membership-corporations law of the State of New York; with amendments (Rept. No. 1722); ordered to be printed.

On April 3, 1956:

By Mr. SMATHERS, from the Select Committee on Small Business:

A report entitled "Military Procurement—1956—Volume 1" (Rept. No. 1723); ordered to be printed.

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 29, 1956:

On April 7, 1956:

Mr. GEORGE, from the Select Committee for Contribution Investigation, pursuant to Senate Resolution 205 establishing a select committee to investigate circumstances involving alleged improper attempts through political contributions to influence the vote of Senator CASE of South Dakota on the so-called natural-gas bill (Rept. No. 1724); ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of March 29, 1956,

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on March 30, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 101. An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens;

S. 117. An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens;

S. 213. An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens and to cancel deportation proceedings in the cases of certain aliens;

S. 315. An act to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

S. 396. An act to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens;

S. 500. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes;

S. 663. An act for the relief of William T. Collins (Vasilios T. Buzunis);

S. 963. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 1242. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 1289. An act to establish a domestic relations branch in the municipal court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress;

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress; and

S. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On March 29, 1956:

S. 1271. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes;

S. 1272. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes;

S. 1585. An act to provide for the return to the town of Hartford, Vt., of certain land which was donated by such town to the United States as a site for a veterans' hospital and which is no longer needed for such purposes; and

S. 3452. An act to amend the act of July 15, 1955, Public Law 161, 84th Congress (69 Stat. 324), by increasing the appropriation authorization for the aircraft control and warning system.

On April 2, 1956:

S. 760. An act for the relief of Pietro Meduri;

S. 1992. An act to provide for the conveyance of a certain tract of land in Madison County, Ky., to the Pioneer National Monument Association; and

S. J. Res. 95. Joint resolution to authorize the American Battle Monuments Commission to prepare plans and estimate for the erection of a suitable memorial to Gen. John J. Pershing.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Lewis R. Knox to be postmaster at Helena, Mont., which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

REPORT ON OPERATION OF UNIFORMED SERVICES CONTINGENCY OPTION ACT OF 1953—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which,

with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 8 of the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953 (Public Law 239, 83d Cong.), I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the First Annual Report of the Operation of the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 9, 1956.

REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) of Public Law 307, 73d Congress, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 9, 1956.

(NOTE.—Only copy of report transmitted to the House of Representatives.)

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy, under title 10, United States Code, section 1056, vice the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1595, Senate Concurrent Resolution 2.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the concurrent resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire if this is the measure on which an agreement to vote next Wednesday is to be proposed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas proposes to propound such a unanimous-consent agreement as soon as there is a quorum call. The Senator from Texas will propound the agreement in accordance with the conversation with the Senator from Arizona.

The Senator from Texas has so drafted the unanimous-consent request, and intends to propound it as soon as the absence of a quorum can be suggested.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request to proceed to the present consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND], the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], I have sent to the desk a proposed unanimous-consent agreement. I ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed agreement will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That, effective on Wednesday, April 11, 1956, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said concurrent resolution shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said concurrent resolution debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said concurrent resolution, allot additional time to any Senator or Senators during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the conference report on the farm bill probably will reach the Senate on either Wednesday or Thursday of this week. The conference report will be a privileged matter, when it is received, will it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; it will be a privileged matter, and may be taken up whenever it is received.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I thank the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Without objection, the agreement is entered.

HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes on Wednesday next, it convene at 11 o'clock a. m.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to state that it is the intention of the leadership on both sides of the aisle to have our action on the unfinished business, the concurrent resolution relating to a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, concluded at an early hour on Wednesday, perhaps at 1:30 or 2 p. m. If the House adopts the conference report on the farm bill by that time, it is the intention of the leadership to have action on the pending concurrent resolution followed immediately by the consideration of the conference report on the farm bill, and to have the Senate remain in session until late that evening, if necessary, in order to try to dispose of that measure.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President—
Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend, the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me ask the eminent majority leader what his plans are in regard to taking up the so-called bank-holding bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. At the moment we have no plans in regard to that bill. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee handling that measure is in Yugoslavia. I called him this morning, to see whether that measure could be brought up today. But until he returns—and I am not informed when he will be ready to have that measure brought before the Senate—I cannot make any definite announcement in that regard. I shall inform my friend, the Senator from Illinois, as soon as the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] returns, and we can ascertain the schedule from him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Texas.

SENATOR FROM SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have before me the credentials of the Honorable THOMAS A. WOFFORD, Senator-designate from the State of South Carolina. The credentials are signed by the Governor of our State, the Honorable George Bell Timmerman, Jr. I send the credentials to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be read.

The credentials were read by the legislative clerk, and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Columbia.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of South Carolina, I, George Bell Timmerman, Jr., the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint, effective April 5, 1956, the Honorable THOMAS A. WOFFORD a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein caused by the resignation of the Honorable Strom Thurmond is filled by election, as provided by law.

Witness: His Excellency our Gov. George Bell Timmerman, Jr., and our seal hereto affixed at Columbia, this 20th day of March, the year of our Lord nineteen hundred fifty-six.

GEORGE BELL TIMMERMAN, Jr.,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] O. FRANK THORNTON,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator-designate will present himself at the desk, the oath of office will be administered to him.

Mr. WOFFORD, escorted by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, advanced to the Vice President's desk; and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President, and was subscribed by the new Senator.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the morning hour there be a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION TO PAY CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS (S. Doc. No. 110)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation to pay claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments rendered against the United States, in the amount of \$752,779, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay indefinite interest and costs and to cover increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AVAILABILITY OF EMERGENCY CREDIT TO FARMERS AND STOCKMEN

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 31, 1954, as amended, so as to extend the availability of emergency credit to farmers and stockmen (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION CHARTER ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law a report on overobligations of appropriations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL RESERVE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the National Industrial Reserve, dated April 1, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS WITH COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the exchange of lands at the United States Naval Station, San Juan, Puerto Rico, between the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the United States of America (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT WORK

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Supply and Logistics, reporting, pursuant to law, that during the 6 months from July 1, 1955, through December 31, 1955, no new contracts were negotiated for research and development work; to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950, RELATING TO PAYMENT OF TRAVEL EXPENSES AND PER DIEM ALLOWANCES

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Battle Creek, Mich., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend further the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to authorize the Administrator to pay travel expenses and per diem allowances to trainees in attendance at the National Civil Defense Staff College, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the year 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration, for the period July 1-December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

A letter from the Acting Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the

international educational exchange program, Department of State, for the period January 1-June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the international educational exchange program, for the calendar year 1955 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL REGISTER ACT, RELATING TO CERTAIN PUBLIC NOTICES

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Register Act, as amended, so as to provide for the effectiveness and notice to the public of proclamations, orders, regulations, and other documents in a period following an attack or threatened attack upon the continental United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON ALASKA RAILROAD

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Alaska Railroad, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON LITTLE WOOD RIVER PROJECT, IDAHO

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the Little Wood River project, Idaho (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

FINAL PROOF OF SETTLEMENT ON UNSURVEYED PUBLIC LAND IN ALASKA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to allow a homesteader settling on unsurveyed public land in Alaska to make single final proof prior to survey of the lands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONVEYANCE OF HOMESTEAD ALLOTMENTS TO INDIANS OR ESKIMOS IN ALASKA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the conveyance of homestead allotments to Indians or Eskimos in Alaska (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1343 OF TITLE 18, U. S. CODE, RELATING TO FRAUD BY WIRE, RADIO, OR TELEVISION

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1343 of title 18, United States Code, relating to fraud by wire, radio, or television (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of February 29, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF PACIFIC MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission, Portland, Oreg., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the year 1955 (with an

accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF ANNUAL MEETING OF JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the proceedings of the annual meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held at Washington, D. C., September 19-20, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON PAYMENT OF CLAIMS ARISING FROM CORRECTION OF MILITARY OR NAVAL RECORDS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED BIPARTISAN COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS—ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting drafts of proposed legislation to establish a Bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights in the Executive Branch of the Government, and to provide for an additional Assistant Attorney General (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE, UNITED STATES COURTS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report, for the fiscal year 1955, together with the reports of the annual and special meetings of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held in 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF DIRECTORS OF FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES

A letter from the Secretary, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Directors of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIEN DEFECTORS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain alien defectors (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Nikola Mirko Vujosevic or Vujosevich from a report transmitted to the Senate on May 18, 1955, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, with a view to the adjustment of his immigration status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Tang Tsou from a report relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, transmitted by him to the Senate on August 1, 1955 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE FILED BY CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXPANSION OF TEACHING AND RESEARCH IN EDUCATION OF MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CONFORMATION OF APPOINTMENT AND COMPENSATION OF CHIEF LEGAL OFFICER, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to conform the appointment and compensation of the chief legal officer of the Post Office Department to the method of appointment and rate of compensation provided for comparable positions, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

A letter from the secretary, National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that society, for the year ended April 1, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Joint Resolution 2

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation and appropriate moneys as proposed in H. R. 4446, a bill to provide assistance to the States in the construction, modernization, additions, and improvements of domiciliary and hospital buildings of State veterans' homes by a grant to subsidize, in part, the capital outlay cost

"Whereas there is an alarming shortage of hospital and domiciliary beds in California provided by the United States Veterans' Administration for veterans of all wars;

"Whereas the ever-increasing migration of veterans into California from every State in the Nation has brought here hundreds upon hundreds of thousands of veterans; and

"Whereas the veterans population of California stands today as one of if not the largest in the United States; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has recognized assistance given by the States in their care for thousands of disabled war veterans through Federal aid subsidies in part payment for day-by-day operating expenses to maintain establishments for the care of such veterans; and

"Whereas a master-building program of the Veterans' Home of California ultimately will provide hospital and domiciliary beds for 3,300 disabled California veterans; and

"Whereas the construction of four new buildings containing 800 beds for such purposes will be urgently needed in the next few years; and

"Whereas financial assistance in part will be needed from the Federal Government for construction of these buildings: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the legislature of this State respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation and appropriate moneys as proposed in H. R. 4446, 84th Congress, 1st session, introduced by the Honorable GEORGE P. MILLER, Congressman, Eighth District, California, which provides States with Federal aid in part for construction, modernization, additions, and improvements of State-operated soldiers' homes; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Administrator of the Veterans' Affairs, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution relative to the enactment of Federal highway legislation

"Whereas the California Legislature at its 1955 session adopted Senate Joint Resolution No. 28, California 1955 Statutes, Chapter 126 of Resolutions, relative to the enactment of Federal highway legislation; and

"Whereas the Congress has not, up to this time, enacted such Federal highway legislation; and

"Whereas there is now pending before the Congress legislation pertaining to the highways of the Nation, which, if enacted by the Congress, will be of great importance to California, not only as to that portion of the

national system of interstate highways but to all other public highways in California: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is memorialized to enact legislation at the current session for the completion of the system of interstate highways, without interfering with the orderly allocation of funds to the other systems of Federal-aid highways, and that such legislation should recognize the principles set forth in Senate Joint Resolution No. 28, giving particular emphasis to:

"1. That the formula for the allocation of funds among the various States for the improvement of the system of interstate highways should be based upon the cost of completing the system in each State, as related to the cost of completing the entire national system.

"2. That any provision for credit by reason of the previous completion or toll financing of any portion of the national system be subordinated to the completion of the entire system and that if credit is to be given to any State therefor, such credit be considered as a portion of the allocation to such State under the above formula.

"3. That in formulating such legislation the Congress give due consideration to the experience and demonstrated ability of the States to perform highway work under existing Federal and State law and procedures that have been promulgated thereunder; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution and copies of Senate Joint Resolution No. 28, California 1955 Statutes, Chapter 126 of Resolutions, be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the chairmen of the appropriate committees of the Congress, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of California."

"Senate Joint Resolution 28

"Joint resolution relative to the enactment of Federal highway legislation

"Whereas the President of the United States has placed before Congress the matter of the improvement of the roads, streets, and highways throughout the Nation, giving special emphasis from the standpoint of national defense to the rapid completion of the Interstate System of Highways; and

"Whereas there are now numerous bills pending before the Congress relating to the improvement of the Federal aid systems of highways; and

"Whereas the Interstate System is now recognized by Federal law as including 40,000 miles of highways throughout the United States but at the present time only 37,600 miles have been designated as being on said system, it being understood that that portion of said remaining 2,400 miles which will be allocated to California will comprise circumferential and other connecting routes in metropolitan areas; and

"Whereas that portion of the Interstate System located within California includes highways most seriously deficient from the standpoint of traffic volumes, traffic safety, and structural inadequacy; and

"Whereas the completion of the Interstate System from Federal funds would permit the more rapid correction of the remaining deficiencies on the public streets and highways in California: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is memorialized to enact legislation for the completion of the Interstate System within the shortest feasible period of time, and that such legislation should recognize the following principles:

"1. That the provisions for the Federal financing of the Interstate System should

permit long-range planning, to the end that the system can be completed as rapidly as possible and as a free system of highways.

"2. That the program for improving the Interstate System should not interfere with the orderly allocation of funds for the other Federal-aid systems of highways.

"3. That the formula for the allocation of additional funds among the various States for improvement of the Interstate System should be based upon the needs for improvement of that system in the various States, and that such formula should be made definite and certain, so that the various States may plan and construct said Interstate System as rapidly as possible in an orderly manner.

"4. That the provisions requiring States to match Federal funds for the improvement of the Interstate System should not require a greater outlay by the States for such system than was required in amount to match the 1956 allocations for that system under the 1954 Federal Highway Act.

"5. That the preparation of the plans and specifications of projects, their priority, and the handling of the construction work be substantially as has previously been provided under existing Federal-aid legislation.

"6. That if credit is to be given to any State by reason of the previous completion or toll financing of any portion of the Interstate System, the legislation be so drafted that such credits be taken into consideration in computing the allocation formula, so that no delays will result while such credits are being computed; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the chairmen of the appropriate committees of the Congress, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of California."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution relative to the enactment of Federal highway legislation

"Whereas the California Legislature at its 1955 session adopted Senate Joint Resolution No. 28, California 1955 Statutes, chapter 126 of resolutions, relative to the enactment of Federal highway legislation; and

"Whereas the Congress has not, up to this time, enacted such Federal highway legislation; and

"Whereas there is now pending before the Congress legislation pertaining to the highways of the Nation which, if enacted by the Congress, will be of great importance to California, not only as to that portion of the National System of Interstate Highways but to all other public highways in California: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is memorialized to enact legislation at the current session for the completion of the National System of Interstate Highways, without interfering with the orderly allocation of funds to the other systems of Federal-aid highways, and that such legislation should recognize the principles set forth in Senate Joint Resolution No. 28, giving particular emphasis to:

"1. That the formula for the allocation of funds among the various States for the improvement of the National System of Interstate Highways should be based upon the cost of completing the system in each State, as related to the cost of completing the entire national system.

"2. That any provision for credit by reason of the previous completion or toll financing of any portion of the national system be subordinated to the completion of the entire system and that if credit is to be given to any State therefor, such credit be considered as a portion of the allocation to such State under the above formula.

"3. That in formulating such legislation the Congress give due consideration to the

experience and demonstrated ability of the States to perform highway work under existing Federal and State law and procedures that have been promulgated thereunder; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution and copies of Senate Joint Resolution No. 28, California 1955 Statutes, Chapter 126 of Resolutions be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the chairmen of the appropriate committees of the Congress, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of California."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution relative to the 'Status of Forces Treaty'

"Whereas on June 19, 1951, the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty, including the United States, entered into an agreement commonly referred to as the 'Status of Forces Treaty,' which was ratified by the Senate of the United States on July 15, 1953; and

"Whereas, this agreement confers on each of the contracting nations criminal jurisdiction over the military personnel of the other contracting nations stationed in the former; and thus permits American military personnel accused of crime to be tried in the courts and according to the laws of other countries; and

"Whereas, in many countries where American military personnel are stationed the law does not provide the same safeguards as are provided by the courts of this country, including such fundamental requirements of due process as a full statement of the specifications of the crime alleged, right to bail, presentation to the grand jury in all serious cases, fair trial by an unbiased judge and jury, confrontation of witnesses, presumption of innocence, and entitlement to counsel; and

"Whereas foreign military personnel stationed in this country would under the agreement be placed in a better position than our servicemen since they would be entitled to the safeguards mentioned, indicating that the agreement is not truly reciprocal; and

"Whereas there is no justification whatever for this country continuing such an arrangement that is so unfair and unjust to those who are making the greatest sacrifices to serve the Nation and who are entitled to the full protection of our Government; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Members of the Legislature of the State of California take this means to indicate their dissatisfaction with the so-called 'Status of Forces Treaty,' and to urge the Federal Government to terminate that agreement at the earliest possible time; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be hereby directed to transmit suitably prepared copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to institute proceedings to evaluate the Federal fiscal policy and taxing power as it affects the three levels of government, and to effectuate such evaluation by the calling of a constitutional convention to consider same

"Whereas the people and the General Assembly of South Carolina have voted to increase substantially outlays and taxes in South Carolina for our public schools and

other needed projects which it is the exclusive responsibility of the State to provide; and

"Whereas greater sums will be necessary to meet pressing needs; and

"Whereas with the increase and extension of the scope and magnitude of Federal taxation there is a resulting diminution of revenue sources available to the State and a consequent diminution of revenue sources of remaining to local governments; and

"Whereas it is obvious that the people of the United States are confronted with a financial crisis, unparalleled in history, with our future form of government turning on the decision as to how to finance these vital State and local functions from State and local revenues as they should be under our form of government; and

"Whereas the time has now come for Congress to face this problem realistically and to recognize that an evaluation must be made of the Federal fiscal policy and taxing power and the effect thereof upon the three levels of government; and to this end, Congress should initiate such a study by the creation of a joint and representative body which will be vested with the authority and duty to consider and make such recommendations as may be necessary to preserve State sovereignty in this respect, including the consideration, should such be deemed necessary, of an appropriate constitutional limitation upon the Federal taxing power; and

"Whereas Congress should then effectuate said recommendations to propose such constitutional amendments as may be deemed necessary or by the proposal of an amendment embodying said recommendations to be submitted to the States for ratification: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring):

"1. That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully petitioned to institute a study of the Federal taxing power and fiscal policy as they affect each level of government, by the creation of a joint and representative body which will include in its consideration the propriety of a constitutional limitation upon the Federal taxing power in order to preserve State sovereignty.

"2. That the findings and recommendations of such a body by proposing such constitutional amendments as may be deemed necessary and appropriate or by the proposing by Congress of an appropriate constitutional amendment for ratification by the States.

"3. That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Senator and Member of Congress from this State."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Finance:

"Whereas the increased importation of numerous products that come into competition with the output of factories, farms, and mines of Pennsylvania, replacing the products of Pennsylvania's industries, is a constant menace to the State's continuing economic stability; and

"Whereas the lower wages paid abroad make it impossible for many of our smaller and medium-sized producers to compete with imports without resorting to ruinous price cutting, which in turn would result either in financial losses or heavy pressure for wage reductions and outright unemployment; and

"Whereas our national obligations have reached such extreme proportions that the national income must be maintained at its present unprecedented high level, or close thereto, lest we become insolvent; and

"Whereas unemployment caused by the imports of residual oil, which increased 300 percent from an average of 45 million barrels in 1946, to more than 136 million barrels

in 1954, or the yearly equivalent of 33 million tons of coal; and unemployment caused by imports of crude oil; various types of glass, steel, aluminum, brass, and zinc products; pottery and chinaware; granite, tiles, cement, hardboard, plywood, hardware, plumbing, flat glass, and other building supplies; lace, carpets, and all kinds of woolen, cotton, and synthetic fiber manufactured goods; leather and fabric gloves; bicycles; hydraulic turbines; machine tools and other machinery; heavy electrical equipment and other electrical industry products and electronics; watches, clocks, and parts; optical industry products; cutlery; scientific apparatus; pencils and pens; pins, clips, and fasteners; soft fiber; insulation board and manufactured cork products; chemicals; toys, mushrooms; farm, dairy, and dried-milk products; wallpaper, hats, and millinery; printing industry products; ladies handbags and leather goods; nails, wire, screws, bolts, and nuts and many other commodities; will render the upholding of the economy at its highest levels most uncertain and difficult, unless all import trade is placed on a fair competitive basis and the potential injury therefrom thus eliminated; and

"Whereas agricultural products such as wheat, wheat flour, cotton, butter, cheese, and peanuts enjoy the protection of import quotas; and

"Whereas a maximum of satisfactory trade results from a prosperous domestic economy freed from the threat of a breakdown resulting from unfair import competition: Therefore be it

"Resolved (if the house of representatives concurs), That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States that adequate safeguards be provided in tariff and trade legislation, including import quotas, against the destruction or lowering of our American standard of living, the labor standard of our workmen, and the stability of our economy by unfair import competition and that the existing trade-agreements legislation be amended accordingly; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each Senator and Representatives from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress requesting the passage of legislation requiring the Federal Government to defray costs of cleaning, dredging, and widening the Blackstone River channel

"Whereas there is a dire necessity because of floods, hurricanes, and other acts of God to clean, dredge, and widen the Blackstone River channel, particularly that portion of the river in Massachusetts; and

"Whereas the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has been unduly burdened with overwhelming expenses because of said floods, hurricanes, and other acts of God; and

"Whereas the defraying by the Federal Government of the costs of such improvements would be of inestimable benefit to the inhabitants of the Blackstone Valley in particular, and to all of the inhabitants of the Commonwealth, in general; and

"Whereas such improvements are a normal and natural function of the Federal Government: Therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts urges the Congress of the United States to pass necessary legislation defraying such costs; and be it further

"Resolved, That the State secretary send copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth, and to the Chief Engineer of the War Department."

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to grant certain aid to Israel and to implement the joint declaration of the United States, Great Britain, and France guaranteeing the peace and security of Israel

"Whereas the Governments of the United States, Great Britain, and France by a tripartite declaration have guaranteed territorial integrity of the State of Israel; and

"Whereas certain Arabian countries by the acceptance of arms from Communist countries have provided the Soviet Union with the opportunities to advance Communist influence in the Middle East; and

"Whereas the influx of arms into Arabian countries disturbs the military balance of power in the Middle East, and thereby threatens the peace of the world; and

"Whereas the United States has recently shipped tanks to Saudi Arabia in direct violation of the declared United States policy of discouraging an arms race in the Middle East; and

"Whereas the State of Israel has requested from the State Department of the United States permission to purchase certain arms and supplies in order to meet the threat of certain Arabic countries, which request has not been acted upon after a period of 4 months from the time of such request: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to insure the discouragement of a potential arms race in the Middle East; that the United States authorize the sale of arms and supplies to Israel in order to provide for the security of Israel and to establish a balance of military power between Israel and the Arab nations; that further shipment of arms to Arab nations be prohibited; and that steps be taken to enforce the provisions of the tripartite declaration of the United States, Great Britain, and France, thereby insuring the territorial integrity of the State of Israel, and that such action be taken as may best promote peace between Israel and the Arab countries and throughout the Middle East; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the United States Secretary of State, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress of the United States and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth."

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors, Erie County, Buffalo, N. Y., relating to retirement benefits for certain persons; to the Committee on Finance.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the Uniontown, Pa., chapter, Order of Ahepa, signed by William Gregory, president, embodying a resolution adopted by that organization, favoring self-determination by the people of Cyprus; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted at a public assembly held at St. George Greek Orthodox Memorial Parish House, Springfield, Mass., relating to self-determination of Cyprus; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Florida Junior Chamber of Commerce, at Tallahassee, Fla., favoring the widespread dissemination of the recommendations and findings of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from the San Jose Chamber of Commerce, San Jose, Calif., signed by Russell E. Pettit, manager, favoring the continuance for 2 years of the Advisory Committee on Weather Modification; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by Pastorius Unit 33, Steuben Society of America, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring a complete return of privately owned German and Japanese property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Florida Junior Chamber of Commerce, at Tallahassee, Fla., favoring a proclamation that all election days be patriotic holidays for the purpose of displaying the American flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the Lima, Ohio, Traffic Club, member of the Associated Traffic Clubs of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A telegram, in the nature of a petition, signed by Mr. B. S. Williams, of Atlanta, Ga., favoring the enactment of legislation to create the office of Second Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A statement adopted by the general executive board of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, relating to the so-called manifesto of southern Congressmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the California Highway Commission, Sacramento, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to complete the national system of interstate highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the New York chapter, American Institute of Architects, New York, N. Y., protesting against any alteration of the east front of the Capitol Building in Washington, D. C., to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by Columbus Council 126, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treaty-making power; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 3

"Joint memorial requesting the Arizona congressional delegation to initiate legislation in the Congress of the United States stabilizing the financial features of the program for the education of Indian children within this State

"To the HONORABLE CARL HAYDEN AND THE HONORABLE BARRY M. GOLDWATER, MEMBERS OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES; AND THE HONORABLE JOHN J. RHODES AND THE HONORABLE STEWART L. UDALL, MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents: "The people of the State of Arizona are concerned about the education of Indian children in the public schools of the State.

"In view of the total Indian population of some 70,000 and the anticipated increase in the number of Indian children of school age, and the tremendous amount of land held in trust for the Indian people and which is exempt from State and local taxation, the Federal Government must continue to bear a very substantial part of the cost of integrating the Indian children in the public schools of the State.

"We are aware that the Federal Government has recognized, at least for the time being, that this financial responsibility is theirs.

"We are concerned, however, and rightfully so, over the possibility that the entire financial burden may at any time be shifted to the taxpayers of the State.

"We are justified in this concern because of the recent negotiation of contracts for the

integration of Indian children in our school system. These contracts obligate the school districts of the State to accept such children over a period of 20 years; yet the contracts declare, insofar as the Federal Government is concerned, that the life of the contracts depends on the availability of Federal funds.

"The State and the school districts should not be subjected to this uncertainty.

"Hence, we request that you initiate legislation which will insure, as far as is reasonably possible, to this State the continued Federal responsibility for the education of Indian children over the 20-year contractual period now embodied in such contracts."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Memorial 9

"Memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation extending the provisions of the Bacon-Davis Act as set forth in the provisions of sections 276a through 276a-5, title 40, United States Code annotated

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"It appears that the United States Government may in the near future undertake a huge program of highway construction and a school building-construction program throughout the United States. Moreover, the development of these programs will undoubtedly require the employment of thousands of wage earners in each of the 48 States by contractors who are the successful bidders for the particular work to be performed.

"In view of these circumstances it is important to the economy of our country and for purposes of equity that persons employed be paid wages based on the prevailing wage for corresponding types of work in the geographical area where the work is being performed.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the Congress of the United States enact legislation extending the provisions of sections 276a through 276a-5, title 40, United States Code annotated, known as the Bacon-Davis Act.

"2. The Bacon-Davis Act as now constituted prescribes that the prevailing wages shall be paid to persons employed in constructing, repairing or altering public buildings or public works. The members of the House of Representatives urge that the Bacon-Davis Act be extended to apply in an equal manner to highway construction and school-building programs."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona identical with the foregoing; which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Memorial 13

"Memorial requesting Congress to create a program for the rehabilitation of the Papago Tribe of Indians for the protection and better utilization of the resources of the tribe

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"The Papago Tribe of Indians, of about 8,000 population, is located on the second largest reservation in the United States, comprising over 2,500,000 acres of desert and mountainous land in southern Arizona. The area, although vast in size, has few known resources. This tribe, because of conditions beyond its control, is in dire need of assistance from the Federal Government.

"A major need of this tribe of Indians is more adequate educational facilities and opportunities. At present the reservation has only 6 Government schools to provide education for about 1,250 children. Some of the schools teach only through the sixth grade; others go to the eighth grade; and only one, the Sells Consolidated School, has a ninth grade. In addition 5 Catholic mission schools serve about 350 children. Some of these schools receive Federal assistance because there are no Government-supported schools near enough so that children in these areas can be served by Government buses. Distances from Papago communities to a Government school are, in some cases, 20 miles. There are no opportunities for Papago children to attend high school on the reservation, and opportunities for the Papagos to attend college anywhere are limited, as is true for all Indians throughout the Western United States.

"While medical facilities have been expanded since the United States Public Health Service assumed the responsibility for the Papago medical program in July 1955, much remains to be done to improve the tragic and deplorable Papago health situation. There are no obstetrical facilities on the entire reservation. It is estimated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs that the life expectancy at birth for a reservation Papago is about 20 years and that 1 infant out of every 4 dies during the first year. This infant mortality rate is the worst in the United States.

"A hospital at Sells to replace the one which burned in 1947 is essential. The present necessity of removing sick persons to distant hospitals in Tucson and Phoenix remains as one of the principal barriers to the Papagos accepting modern medicine. Also there is no tuberculosis sanatorium on the entire reservation and the death rate from this disease is about seven times greater than the average throughout the rest of the United States. Another basic health need is the establishment of more field clinics. At present there are only 3 clinics on the entire reservation to care for all the Papagos, 1 at Sells, 1 in Santa Rosa, and 1 in the isolated village of Pisinimo. This last-mentioned clinic, built by the Papago villagers themselves, is an indication of how desperately field clinics are needed on this reservation. These three field clinics are not staffed by doctors, being visited at intervals only by a doctor.

"The Papago Indian Reservation, located in an extremely arid region, has insufficient wells for both stock water and domestic purposes, an average of only about one well per village. While domestic water storage has been improved during the past year, there are still villages where the only sources of drinking water are open ponds and stock tanks. This water, used for household purposes without boiling, is a major health hazard on the reservation.

"Nor does the irrigation problem stand in any better light. There are only about 15,000 acres or less than one-half of 1 percent of the total reservation area, which are irrigable land. This small amount can support at best only about 200 families of the 1,200 families living on the reservation. Additional farmland can be developed only if additional deep wells are drilled.

"The poverty of the reservation makes it necessary that many members of this tribe must seek all or part of their livelihood away from it. Annually, over half of the families move off the reservation for work in the mines and agricultural fields of southern Arizona. However, at present no effort is being made to develop this Papago effort to attain economic self-sufficiency. Moreover, this migration results in many children being taken out of school and permitted to work in the fields in violation of the child-labor laws.

"At present, the only Federal program for the development of Papago workers is di-

rected toward relocating them in distant urban areas. Under this high-cost program other States get our best Papago citizens and Arizona is left with many economic-problem cases. Relatively large numbers return to the reservation, some with severe social maladjustments as the result of their experiences. Thus the relocation program is now a detriment to Arizona and there is need of modification of same to a more local program. Federal assistance is needed to assist additional Papagos to find work in agriculture, mining, construction, and industry in areas reasonably near to the reservation. This, together with a program of adult and vocational education, including classes to learn to read, write, and speak English, so that those already employed can be upgraded, would go far toward helping solve these important social and economic problems.

"Any of the above circumstances would of itself be sufficient to justify immediate action by the Federal Government; taken in concert the situation of the Papago is desperate beyond human conception. They underlie fundamental social, economic, and health problems which will become increasingly serious and difficult to cope with if not met comprehensively now.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, respectfully prays:

"1. That, although Congress saw fit to close the Papago Reservation to mineral entry, thus undoing an injustice of long standing, for which the citizens of Arizona, both Indian and non-Indian, are grateful, their mineral resources are of no value to these poverty-stricken Papagos as long as they remain undeveloped.

"2. That a survey of the mineral potential of the Papago Reservation be made; that since the tribe has no funds for this survey, Federal funds be made available therefor.

"3. That sufficient funds be appropriated by Congress to create and make effective a comprehensive rehabilitation program to promote the economic and social development of the Papago Indians, such comprehensive program to include:

"(a) An education survey of the reservation to determine exact needs; enough elementary schools on the reservation to permit a choice between Federal and church schools; funds for construction of dormitories in towns adjacent to the reservation to afford Papago children the opportunity to attend junior and senior high schools, and also the opportunity to attend colleges off the reservation.

"(b) Funds for rigid enforcement of child-labor laws and school-attendance laws.

"(c) Efforts to integrate Papagos into the off-reservation economic life of the State since not all can support themselves on the reservation; funds for surveys of the Papago labor potential, and to provide a special Papago placement program in Arizona which would serve as an alternative to the highly expensive Federal out-of-State relocation program; also a comprehensive program of adult and vocational education, including classes to learn to read, write, and speak English so that Papagos can improve their place among the State's workers.

"(d) A 50-bed general hospital is needed at Sells, staffed with sufficient doctors, dentists, nurses, sanitarians, and health educators; a department in said hospital to maintain vital statistics; also the construction of a number of small clinics in the major Papago communities, to be staffed with medical personnel to administer to the health needs of the Papagos and win their confidence through personalized services.

"(e) More wells for household, stock, and irrigation purposes.

"(f) A revolving credit fund to provide development capital to enable small businesses, mines, and agricultural developments

to be started by the Papagos on the reservation.

"(g) More all-weather roads and market-access roads.

"(h) Range-improvement measures.

"(i) Large-scale survey of all reservation economic resources.

"(j) In general to provide facilities, employment, and essential services in combating hunger, disease, poverty, juvenile delinquency, and demoralization among members of the tribe; to make available the resources of the reservation for use in building up a self-supporting economy and self-reliant communities; and to lay a stable foundation upon which the Papagos can engage in diversified economic activities and ultimately attain standards of living comparable to those enjoyed by other citizens of the State of Arizona and the United States of America."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESOLUTIONS PREPARED BY KANSAS SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. SCHOEPPFEL. Mr. President, the Daughters of the American Revolution will be holding their annual convention next week in the Capital of the United States. In preparation for that convention, the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution have prepared a set of resolutions, which have been forwarded to me. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF THE KANSAS SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH

Whereas a true appreciation of American history is important to good citizenship and a bulwark against the infiltration of alien ideologies; and

Whereas a renewed and increased appreciation of great lessons drawn from studying the history of our country creates increased spiritual strength and wisdom; and

Whereas certain youth groups have become special targets of internationalism, one such well known youth organization having designated February as "International Month": Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution urge its chapters to designate February as "American History Month" and urge the Governor of the State of Kansas and city mayors to officially declare February as "American History Month" to help build a durable heritage of faith, fortitude, and righteousness for future generations.

PATRIOTISM IN EDUCATION

Whereas national security depends upon the character of our citizens and a knowledge of the fundamental principles upon which the United States Government was established, and also an understanding of the forces working toward its destruction; and

Whereas the "training of our youth today determines the security of our Nation tomorrow" presupposes the necessity of specialized instruction regarding the advantages of our system of government above others in order to build good future citizens

and provide for the security of coming generations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution continue and strengthen its interest in the patriotic education of our youth by the support of laws requiring the teaching of American history, civics and the science of the American form of government in our schools; increased supervision in the selection of instructors and materials used; encouragement of more public meetings for the purpose of increasing interest in patriotic education, and other means for accomplishing the objective stated in this resolution.

UNESCO

Whereas the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, known as UNESCO, a specialized agency of the United Nations, has declared among other objectionable things that "nationalism is the major obstacle to the development of world mindedness"; and

Whereas said UNESCO is carrying on powerful propaganda through the American school system and otherwise working toward destruction of the form of government established by the Founding Fathers with the thought of promoting a one world pattern and

Whereas UNESCO is a deliberate plan to create public opinion for world citizenship—especially directed to the school children of the Nation and is patterned exactly after the Communist teaching in Soviet Russia: Therefore be it

Resolved, that the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution go on record as supporting the action taken by the recent national convention of the American Legion at Miami, Fla., urging Congress to take appropriate action to completely disassociate the United States Government from the UNESCO program.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, reaffirm their adamant stand for control of education by the people through their States and local communities only and oppose Federal aid to education.

INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES

Whereas we have on previous occasions stated our approval of investigating committees devoted to protecting our country against the invasion of alien ideologies and the operation of subversive forces: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution reaffirm its previous stand in this regard and commend the efforts of those who are exposing subversive activities and request the Congress to appropriate adequate funds for the continuance of the courageous campaign by our duly elected legislators and their staffs.

APPENDIX NINE

Whereas a special report prepared some years ago by the House Committee on Un-American Activities when Representative Martin Dies was chairman, known as Appendix Nine consisting of several volumes, has been for some reason taken out of circulation; and

Whereas said report is known to contain vital information designed to alert the American people to dangers of subversive activities: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual convention of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution urge the Congress of the United States to authorize the reprinting and circulation of this document and appropriate the necessary funds required to complete the project.

THE FBI

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation has by its integrity, courage, intelligent leadership, and loyalty to the principles upon which the Republic was founded, helped insulate the American people against foes of many types and descriptions: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual convention of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution reiterate confidence in the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its able leadership symbolized by the person of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover.

KANSAS COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Whereas certain States, notably California, have found it advantageous to set up committees on un-American activities to cooperate with various law-enforcement agencies and departments of the Federal Government such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the House Committee on Un-American Activities; and

Whereas the people of Kansas need to be kept informed regarding the mechanics and machinations of the Communist apparatus, and also alerted to the dangers of Communist infiltration among non-Communist groups including schools, civic clubs, churches, labor unions, and other bodies: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual convention of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution suggest that the Kansas State Legislature explore the possibility and advisability of organizing such a committee in Kansas to function along lines comparable to similar committees now existing in other States.

FEDERAL JURY SYSTEM

Whereas the jury system is a fundamental of the American judicial structure and basic to a free society under law and must therefore be protected; and

Whereas recent attempts have been made to undermine and bring this branch of the judicial system into question and disrepute by secretly planting dictaphones in rooms where jurors were deliberating, thereby eavesdropping on their conversations dealing with the innocence or guilt of persons on trial in open court; and

Whereas Attorney General Herbert Brownell proposed on January 10, 1956, that Congress enact a law prohibiting such activities as being inconsistent with the purposes of the seventh amendment to the Constitution of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution go on record as condemning said innovations and urge Congress to do everything possible to expedite enactment of the law proposed by Attorney General Brownell.

RIGHT TO WORK

Whereas the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights guarantees to its citizens certain freedoms including the choice of occupation, a fundamental right of the American heritage; and

Whereas totalitarian systems deny their citizens the rights of such choice thereby making those who labor and all others servants of the state: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution recognize and approve the basic right of all Americans to choose their own vocations and at the same time commend those who are trying by legislative processes to preserve and uphold this sacred right.

IMMIGRATION

Whereas the Immigration and Nationality Act, known as the Walter-McCarran Act (Public Law 414) became effective on December 24, 1952; and

Whereas the act has been especially effective in the denaturalization and deportation

of criminals and subversives and is operating in the best interests of the American people; and

Whereas pressure is being placed upon Government officials and Congress by certain groups to change this law: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of Daughters of the American Revolution reaffirm its approval of the Walter-McCarran Act and urge all patriotic Americans to resist any change, weakening amendments or private bills which would destroy its effectuality.

REVIEW OF U. N. CHARTER

Whereas the 10th General Assembly of the United Nations passed a resolution on November 21, 1955, which calls for a Review Conference, and the Security Council voted its concurrence on December 15, 1955; and

Whereas a Committee of the Whole has been created to work with the Secretary-General of the United Nations in fixing a time and place for the Conference, its organization and procedure, and said Committee is to report its recommendation to the 12th Assembly in 1957; and

Whereas proponents of world government are seeking to propagandize the American people into support of converting the United Nations into a world government wherein the sovereignty of our Republic under constitutional government would be destroyed: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution reaffirm its opposition to world government in any form and urge our Congress to carefully investigate charter review and resist any attempt to convert the United Nations Charter into a world government.

SUPPORTING THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

Whereas treaties shall be the supreme law on the land and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby when two-thirds of the Senators concur; and

Whereas executive agreements may have the same prerogatives; and

Whereas the United States is one of the few nations in which a treaty becomes self-executing automatically; and

Whereas specialized agencies of the United Nations an d other entangling alliances can pose special threats through these treaty-making powers; and

Whereas the supremacy of the United Nations Charter over the United States Constitution has already become an issue in some court cases: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference, Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, reaffirm its support and endorsement of the Bricker amendment which provides that no treaty or other international agreement can become internal except through laws enacted by elected representatives of the American people; and be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution reaffirm its request that the United States Senate consider the advisability of further amending the Constitution, so as to require either a majority or two-thirds vote of the entire membership before any treaty can be adopted.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

Whereas the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party recently declared it a part of their global program to work inside the capitalist world under the slogan "peace," with Khrushchev declaring there are only two roads, "peaceful coexistence or war," and at the same time stating that violent revolution is not necessary now to bring about a Socialist state; and

Whereas the Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the House of Representa-

tives concluded that the history of Czechoslovakia is the history of every government that tried to coexist or cooperate with the Communists; and

Whereas the committee further concluded "that peaceful coexistence is a Communist myth which can be attained only through the complete surrender of our free way of life for one of slavery under Moscow-controlled communism"; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution support a reexamination of the country's foreign policy by the Congress of the United States that America may not succumb to this poisonous formula of peaceful coexistence distilled by communism; and be it further

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference call upon our Government and its citizens to heed the warning: "When they shall say peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh upon them."

WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Whereas the World Council of Churches has on its official roster leaders from the Iron Curtain countries, as for example Prof. Josef L. Hromadka, Prague, Czechoslovakia, a member of the executive committee; Dr. Jan Chadaba, of Czechoslovakia, member of the central committee; Dr. Victor Hajek, of Czechoslovakia, synodical senior of the Church of the Czech Brethren, member of the central committee of the World Council; Bishop Janos Peter, of Hungary, delegate to the World Council; and

Whereas such men are exercising a baneful influence on the Christian program through the world and Communists are known to use the church as a cloak to cover their teachings; and

Whereas Paul the Apostle said "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness and what communion hath light with darkness?": Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution call upon its members to be alert and protest any contamination of the holy Christian faith which comes to their attention.

REDEDICATION TO RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLES

Whereas by the dispensation of divine grace we are favored to live in a nation founded on a fundamental belief in God; and

Whereas the thought of mankind is today being invaded and poisoned by atheistic philosophies and doctrines designed to destroy faith in the supernatural content of historical and evangelical Christianity, in the name of so-called "liberal theology," the "brotherhood of man," and related teachings: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution rededicate itself to continued faith, sincere prayer, steadfast belief in the Bible and greater participation in the field of Christian activities.

Mrs. W. HAROLD HAWKINS,
Chairman.
(Miss) MAUDE B. SKINNER,
Cochairman.

PROTECTION OF DOGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—LETTER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Peoples Lobby, Inc., of Washington, D. C., signed by Mrs. Charles Edward Russell, president, relating to the protection of dogs in the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 27, 1956.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: S. 2015 and H. R. 6680 protect dogs in the District of Columbia. It may be said that this is but a crumb but will Congress deny us even that crumb? Surely, dogs, the beloved of mankind should have sanctuary someplace, sometime, and where better than the Nation's Capital, now. Can one look into his pet's eyes, the one utterly devoted to him in loyalty, and say, "You must be ruthlessly used as a tortured instrument of student practice." Christianity teachers benevolence and surely that extends to man's best friend. He is an unyielding friend even in dire necessity. Is it enough that he lay down his life for us; must he be also tortured?

God be with you in your effort. And may I say that public opinion is with you. Too long have the various societies fought the good fight alone. Overlooked has been public opinion, the average citizen who though not known as a humanitarian or society member is just as much concerned with the welfare of the dog, man's best friend.

There are many humanitarian groups in the United States organized to allay and prevent the unwarranted suffering visited upon animals. Throughout our land self-sacrificing men and women strive unceasingly to better the lot of these defenseless ones. They devote their time and substance to this praiseworthy work, this Christian endeavor. And their accomplishments de-dound to their credit.

They educate the populace in humane endeavors, they provide animal shelters, they rescue stray animals and return them to their proper owners or find new havens for them. They, in a word, instill into our Christian consciousness an appreciation of God's handiwork.

However, when it comes to the point of reducing concern for animals to protective legislation there is an evident record of lack of accomplishment. The failures may be attributed to two patent defects. First, the lack of unity. There is a wide diversity of opinion amongst the various groups as to which action should be taken. There is no united front of all the friends of animals. This, despite the fact that they are all humanitarians and should consider the enactment of any measure of protective legislation as a step forward even though it is not the actual legislation they favored. Second, public opinion has had no voice. The humanitarian groups, after all, are but a segment of our population and as such do not have sufficient impact in the matter of persuading legislators to their viewpoint. The legislator is elected by majority vote and it follows that he will be influenced, in the main, by majority opinion.

Many of the leaders of movements for animal protective legislation in the past are today discouraged and disheartened. They state that attainment of such legislation is impossible. They state, further, that this is not the psychological moment and that the bulk of the people are antagonistic to any corrective legislation.

We sharply disagree with these defeatists. Public opinion is overwhelmingly opposed to the torture of animals. If ours is a Christian Nation, and it is, can any follower of the all-loving Christ fail to display a benevolent, kindly attitude toward God's lesser creatures? It remains for this public sentiment to be vividly portrayed for the benefit

of legislators. This is the most persuasive factor in the consideration of any legislation.

Peoples Lobby, Inc., Washington 6, D. C., is a nonprofit organization chartered for the sole purpose of procurement of protective legislation for animals. It provides a common ground for unity of legislative action by all society members and other humanitarians, combined with the impact of public opinion.

Our officers are: President, Mrs. Charles Edward Russell, Washington, D. C.; vice presidents, Mrs. Alma T. Opal, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. P. C. Chapman, St. Petersburg, Fla.; trustees, Mrs. Frederick Bertram, Tenaflly, N. J.; Mrs. Betty B. Eilers, Phoenix, Ariz.; chairman of the board of directors, Charles M. Davis, Washington 6, D. C.; legislative counsel, Hon. J. Hardin Peterson, Lakeland, Fla.; counsel-treasurer, James M. Barrett, Washington, D. C.; secretary, Emory S. Avant, Washington, D. C.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. THERESA H. RUSSELL,
CHARLES EDWARD RUSSELL.

President.

DISCONTINUANCE OF TRAINS CAUSED BY DIVERSION OF MAIL TO TRUCK CARRIERS—LETTER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from E. George Siedle, Assistant Postmaster General, relating to the discontinuance of certain trains caused by the diversion of mail to truck carriers.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D. C., March 29, 1956.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: You, like myself, attended the dinner of the Federation for Railway Progress and heard President Kennedy of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

During the course of his remarks Mr. Kennedy made reference to certain Post Office Department transportation activities regarding which he was either mistaken or misinformed. His remarks have since been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Friday, March 23, 1956.

Realizing that as a Member of Congress you are vitally interested in the policies and conduct of the postal service, I feel that it is my duty to set the record straight.

Let me point out what Mr. Kennedy said, and show what the actual facts are.

1. Mr. Kennedy stated: "Literally hundreds of passenger trains have been pulled off * * * because the mail has been taken away and awarded to trucks."

The facts are: For the period February 1, 1953, to December 31, 1954 (a typical period), a total of 350 trains were discontinued. Of these, 311 were discontinued because the railroads took positive action to withdraw the trains before any mail was diverted. Only 39 trains were discontinued after mail had been diverted for service or cost reasons.

2. Mr. Kennedy said: "Trucks are obliged to bid against each other as contract carriers, and I am told a very large number of successful bidders have gone broke in their bargain services to the Department."

The facts are: Federal statutes require the Department to award contracts for motor carrier operations to the lowest responsible bidder. Competitive bidding is mandatory. Department records show that less than one-tenth of 1 percent of successful bidders have failed annually.

3. Mr. Kennedy said: "Mail which it (Post Office Department) ships by rail is handled at a profit, and mail by air at a tremendous loss."

The facts are: Since nearly all nonlocal mail is carried by more than one mode of transportation before arrival at destination, it is impracticable to allocate revenues or cost to a single segment of a through movement. For this reason there is no way of determining a "profit" or "loss" on rail movement as against air movement. Revenues and expenses have been allocated, however, as between classes of mail. As shown by our cost ascertainment report, the Department experiences heavy losses on those classes of mail which move by surface means, chiefly by rail. On the other hand, it is on the class of mail which moves principally by air that the Department most nearly breaks even. It is therefore obvious that Mr. Kennedy's statement has no factual basis.

4. Mr. Kennedy said: "Yet, despite this loss, the Post Office Department is engaging in an experiment * * * shipping 3-cent mail between important terminals by air. This action is absolutely illegal except as an experiment."

The facts are: The 3-cent airlift on a non-priority basis has substantially improved service without added cost to the Department. The legality of the operation was questioned in a suit brought by five principal railroads and it was upheld unanimously by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia in a decision rendered in December 1955. The court refused to put any limit on the length of time an experiment may be carried on.

As you are aware, it has always been Post Office Department policy to utilize the speediest available means of transportation. The Department must, therefore, take fullest advantage of the new developments in air and highway transport. This does not mean that we are abandoning railroad service. Far from it. Of a total of \$439 million expected to be paid by the postal service to all forms of transportation companies in fiscal year 1956, the railroads will receive an estimated \$302 million. This is more than twice as much as will be received by all other forms of transportation combined.

In making changes in transportation, the Department is definitely committed to economy as well as service improvement. In pursuance of this policy the total sum paid out to carriers for postal transportation was reduced from \$421 million in fiscal 1953 to \$378 million in fiscal 1955 even though the volume of mail increased 8.4 percent.

Since you had Mr. Kennedy's remarks published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it occurs to me that you would care likewise to have published this letter giving the Post Office Department's side of the story.

Sincerely yours,

E. GEORGE SIEDLE,
Assistant Postmaster General.

RESOLUTIONS OF NORTH DAKOTA RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION, INC.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the North Dakota Reclamation Association, Inc., favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 863) to govern the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of water.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Whereas it has been the settled rule of law for nearly a century that water rights in Midwestern and Western States are determined by State law, and not otherwise; and

Whereas it has also been the established rule that control and jurisdiction over the waters of streams and rivers have been vested in the several States subject to whatever control the Federal Government has found necessary to exercise in the case of navigable waters in its regulation of navigation under the commerce clause of the United States Constitution; and

Whereas section 210 of the constitution of North Dakota provides that "all flowing streams and natural water courses shall forever remain the property of the State for mining, irrigation, and manufacturing purposes," and section 61-0101 of the North Dakota revised code, as amended, provides that "all waters within the limits of the State belong to the public and are subject to appropriation for beneficial use"; and

Whereas the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the recent *Pelton* case, which virtually divested the State of Oregon of complete jurisdiction over the waters of the Deschutes River, a nonnavigable stream therein, threatens to jeopardize and impair the control of States in granting and adjudicating rights to the beneficial use of the waters of their streams: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the North Dakota Reclamation Association, Inc., in meeting assembled this 3d day of March 1956, That Congress be, and is hereby urged, to definitely and unambiguously recognize the right and jurisdiction of the several States in and to the waters of streams and natural watercourses therein by speedily enacting into law Senate bill 863 proposed by Senator FRANK BARRETT, of Wyoming, and thereby settle for all time, and beyond question, that the control, use, distribution, and appropriation of the waters of streams and rivers is vested in the States, and not otherwise; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator FRANK BARRETT, Senator WILLIAM LANGER, Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, Congressman USHER L. BURDICK, and Congressman OTTO KRUEGER.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that another resolution adopted by the North Dakota Reclamation Association, Inc., may be printed in the RECORD. This resolution favors the enactment of legislation providing for the establishment of small irrigation projects in cooperation with the States.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the establishment of small irrigation projects in North Dakota and in other States periodically afflicted by drought on account of variation of rainfall is needed to stabilize the production of crops, particularly feed crops, and thereby stabilize the agricultural economy and promote the welfare of the people therein; and

Whereas it has been conservatively estimated, and in fact demonstrated, that because of the routine of specialized detailed investigation, cross checking of design and division of staff into many categories required by Federal regulations, the cost of small irrigation projects, planned, designed, and constructed by the Federal Government is approximately 30-percent larger than the cost of similar projects planned, designed, and constructed by a State or local governmental unit thereof; and

Whereas some Western and Midwestern States, including North Dakota, maintain engineering staffs which, although not specialized, have professional competence in the field of engineering to adequate investigate, plan, design, and construct small multiple-purpose projects: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the North Dakota Reclamation Association, Inc., in meeting assembled this 3d day of March 1956, That the association

does hereby recommend and request that Congress enact a bill providing for the establishment of small irrigation projects in co-operation with the States; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to Hon. WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota; Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG, North Dakota; Hon. CLINTON ANDERSON, New Mexico; Hon. RUSSELL LONG, Louisiana; Hon. ALAN BIBLE, Nevada; Hon. FRANK BARRETT, Wyoming; Hon. ARTHUR WATKINS, Utah; Hon. USHER L. BURDICK, North Dakota; Hon. OTTO KRUEGER, North Dakota; Hon. CLAIR ENGLE, California; Hon. WAYNE ASPINALL, Colorado; Hon. LEO O'BRIEN, New York; Hon. A. L. MILLER, Nebraska; Hon. JOHN SAYLOR, Pennsylvania.

GARRISON DAM AND RESERVOIR PROJECT—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners, Emmons County, N. Dak., favoring the withdrawal of all restrictions on the completion of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States, in the Flood Control Act of 1944, authorized the construction of the Garrison Dam in North Dakota to provide urgently needed flood protection, for diversion to the James, Sheyenne, and Souris Rivers for the irrigation of over 1 million acres of land in North and South Dakota, for production of hydroelectric power for rural electrification, municipal and industrial use, for municipal and industrial water supplies, stabilization of stream flows for stream pollution abatement and improved downstream navigation, for restoration of lakes, and for recreation and fish and wildlife conservation, and propagation and other multiple benefits; and

Whereas, through the coordinated efforts of the Corps of Engineers, the United States Bureau of Reclamation, the North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission, and the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee, it has been determined that a maximum operating pool level for the Garrison Reservoir of 1,850 feet (above mean sea level) is the most economical and will insure a realization of the maximum potential benefits by meeting all requirements of water users and, as a result of this determination, the Corps of Engineers have proceeded to plan, design, and construct the facilities for the project for operation at this pool level; and

Whereas adequate measures have been incorporated in the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project plan and designs for the protection of the city of Williston, the Lewis and Clark and Buford-Trenton irrigation projects from any adverse effects caused by reservoir operation at the maximum pool level of 1,850 feet so that there will not be any interference with the normal use of these areas; and

Whereas the operating pool level of 1,850 feet (above mean sea level) of the Garrison Dam project will insure the maximum production of hydroelectric power for rural electrification, irrigation, municipal and industrial use that, according to studies by the Federal Power Commission, the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee and other, will be needed by these users as soon as it is available; and

Whereas the additional power revenues that would be earned by the power facilities at Garrison Dam when the reservoir for that project is operated at a maximum normal operating pool level of 1,850 feet as compared to a lower level are needed to permit the maximum development of irrigation as au-

thorized by the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas the construction of main stem dams on the Missouri River will permit the construction and enhance the feasibility of small irrigation projects below and adjacent to these reservoirs because of the elimination of bank erosion, reduced power costs and flood protection afforded to the lands involved; and

Whereas the diversion of water from the Missouri River into central and eastern North Dakota for irrigation, municipal water supplies, restoration of lakes, stream pollution abatement, and other purposes has been advocated by many people in North Dakota for the past 70 years and a plan under investigation by the United States Bureau of Reclamation to accomplish this diversion by utilizing the waters stored in the Garrison Reservoir has been determined feasible and can be most efficiently accomplished if the Garrison Reservoir is operated at the 1,850-foot pool level; and

Whereas any reduction of the operating pool level of Garrison Reservoir will be a waste of its capacity to store reserve water for irrigation, municipal water supply, hydroelectric power production, and other uses during periods of drought; and

Whereas the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project is now over 80 percent complete and to curtail progress so as to prevent or delay its full utilization by restricting the operation of the reservoir at any elevation below 1,850 feet for flood protection, irrigation, hydroelectric-power production, and other multiple uses would result in major losses of potential benefits to the people of North Dakota and the entire Missouri Basin, and would not be consistent with good conservation practices; and

Whereas the county of Emmons, State of North Dakota, recognizes the need for the complete utilization of water from the Garrison Reservoir in central and eastern North Dakota as provided by the Garrison diversion plan to provide for this county's continued prosperity any economic expansion through the irrigation of large areas which can be accomplished most efficiently and economically if the Garrison Reservoir is operated at a maximum normal pool elevation of 1,850 feet (above mean sea level): Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of County Commissioners of the County of Emmons, N. Dak., do hereby petition and request the Congress of the United States to withdraw all restrictions on the completion of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project to operate at the maximum operating pool level of 1,850 feet (above mean sea level) and to appropriate sufficient funds to enable the Corps of Engineers to proceed with the project at an efficient rate in procurement of real estate for planning and construction of the project; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to the Honorable WILLIAM LANGER, Senator; the Honorable MILTON R. YOUNG, Senator; the Honorable OTTO KRUEGER, Representative; and the Honorable USHER L. BURDICK, Representative.

Dated this 2d day of March 1955 by the board of county commissioners in session.

W. T. GRUNEFELDER,
Chairman, Board of County
Commissioners, Emmons County, N. Dak.
Attest:

J. A. ALLENSWORTH,
County Auditor.

RESOLUTION OF SHEYENNE VALLEY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC., FINLEY, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Sheyenne

Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc., Finley, N. Dak., protesting against the Hoover Commission proposal relating to the Rural Electrification Administration.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHEYENNE VALLEY
ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.,
Finley, N. Dak., March 21, 1956.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The following is a resolution adopted by our board of directors at the March 14 meeting:

"HOOVER COMMISSION PROPOSAL"

"Whereas the Rural Electrification Administration was brought into being by an act of Congress in 1935 for the purpose of bringing electricity to the rural people who were not served by the utilities; and

"Whereas in order that electrification in these thinly populated areas would be feasible, the Federal Government, through the Rural Electrification Act, made finances available to the various rural-electric cooperatives at a 2-percent interest rate; and

"Whereas during the existence of rural electrification the United States Treasury has made a profit from the interest paid on the money borrowed for the development of rural electrification; and

"Whereas the records show that the rural electric cooperatives have been self-supporting and have made electricity available to 90 percent of all rural areas; and

"Whereas if the Rural Electrification Administration was abandoned and in its place the Rural Electrification Corporation was set up, the cost of money would greatly increase and work a hardship on all rural electrics: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Sheyenne Valley Electric Cooperative of Finley, N. Dak., urge the 2 Senators and the 2 Representatives from North Dakota to vigorously oppose the Hoover recommendation in its entirety; and be it further

Resolved, That the 2 Senators and the 2 Representatives do all in their power to support the present Rural Electrification Act that was adopted by the Congress of the United States in 1935."

Respectfully submitted.

JULIUS ANDERSON,
President.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3575. A bill to repeal all Federal retailers excise taxes, certain manufacturers excise taxes, and the excise taxes on facilities and services; and

S. 3576. A bill to allow an additional income tax exemption for a dependent child who is a full-time college student; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 3577. A bill for the relief of Kew Chan (Chan Kew), Nancy Tsui Mei (Leung) Chan and Cecelia (Oi Fan) Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 3578. A bill for the relief of Domenico A. Morin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN (for Mr. Ives):

S. 3579. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth M. A. de Cuevas Faure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 3580. A bill to provide for the construction, reconstruction, and rehabilitation by the Secretary of the Interior of certain irrigation works of the Hayden Lake Unit, Rathdrum Prairie project, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE:

S. 3581. A bill to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THYE:

S. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Scientific Research; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. (See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

PRINTING OF REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON WELFARE AND PENSION FUNDS AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 235), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the report of the Subcommittee on Welfare and Pension Funds made to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be printed as a Senate document, and that 2,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Scientific Research. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not to exceed 5 minutes, in explanation of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 159) to establish a Joint Committee on Scientific Research, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution lie on the desk until the close of business on Friday of this week, so that other Senators may join as cosponsors of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THYE. I am delighted to yield for a question.

Mr. LANGER. May I ask what the resolution deals with?

Mr. THYE. It relates to the establishment of a committee within Congress to make certain that we keep abreast of scientific student development and the development of scientists in the United States. I shall make a brief explanation of the joint resolution.

Mr. LANGER. Do I understand correctly that it will lie on the desk so that Senators may join as cosponsors?

Mr. THYE. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to join as a cosponsor.

Mr. THYE. That privilege will be extended to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. President, since the release of the initial atomic bomb at the close of World War II, the United States has been placed into a position of world leadership which demands that we pursue two paths of progress which, in a sense, are contrary in purpose but essential to the role in world affairs which we inherited. On the one hand, we represent the free peoples of the world in a quest for peace and freedom. On the other hand, we also represent the bulwark against Communist aggression and domination, which demands the utmost of progress in the development of weapons of modern warfare.

No one can predict at this time whether our destiny is to be written in terms of war or peace. However, it has become obvious that our success in either venture will depend to a great extent on our ability to keep pace with the fabulous and almost unbelievable progress which we are witnessing in the field of scientific and technological advancement. The advent of atomic and nuclear energy has opened up vast new vistas of progress. We see before us the innumerable peacetime uses of atomic and nuclear energy. At the same time, we view the penetrating destructive uses of the same energy which will become a part of any future conflict among nations.

This new scientific and technological era has brought with it difficult problems which have become the responsibility and property of industry, our colleges and universities, our scientists, our teachers, our high schools, the executive branches of the Government, and the Congress of the United States.

Perhaps the most basic problem is that of keeping pace with the rapid strides in these fields which are currently being made. In this connection, we come across another paradox.

At the present time, the United States has taken the lead in scientific and technological development, but at the same time we are faced with a shortage of future manpower in these same fields. We must assume this type of leadership and make certain that it will be retained. That can only be done if we look constantly to the future and make sure that at all times we have the type of highly trained and efficient personnel to continue the advances already begun.

Our best intelligence reports indicate that the Soviet Union today is graduating each year over twice as many engineers and scientists as are being graduated in the United States.

We are faced with a marked and continuing decrease in the number of quali-

fied teachers at the high school and college levels in the basic science fields. As a result of this, we also have fewer and fewer students each year who are pursuing studies in the sciences and in engineering. The number of students taking courses in mathematics, physics, chemistry, and other related subjects is dropping off.

This, then, is the crux of the problem—at the same time that science and technology are moving to a position of unprecedented importance—the manpower to maintain that progress is declining.

It is for this reason that I have introduced the resolution to establish a Joint Committee of the House and Senate on Scientific Research.

The need for such a committee seems most apparent and urgent. The legislative branch of Government cannot escape the fact that it is going to become more deeply involved and enmeshed in this vast area of activity. We will be called on to legislate on the many problems and issues which are bound to arise. It is incumbent upon the legislative branch to be fully informed on future developments. We will be called upon to work with plans and programs established by the executive branch of Government. In short, we will be, in part, responsible for the success or failure of our country's attempt to advance and expand our leadership in these fields.

None of the committees which we now have are equipped to meet this type of responsibility. Each committee is overburdened with an ever-increasing workload. Present committees do not have the time or the technical staffs to carry out this assignment.

The joint committee, under this resolution, would not have legislative authority. It would be given wide authority in the areas of study and investigation. It would work in cooperation with the executive agencies, industry, and our institutions of learning. It would, as a result of its work, be in a position to advise and counsel the proper legislative committees which will be called upon to legislate in these areas.

There is precedent for this type of committee. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is the most recent and perhaps the most similar precedent. When that committee was established, it was recognized that there was a need for a committee which could devote its energies and time to the study of the many problems involved in the use of atomic energy. There was no standing committee that could meet the need.

The Joint Committee on Scientific Research would embrace an entirely different field than the Joint Atomic Energy Committee. It would be wider in its scope of interest. It would not conflict with the Atomic Energy Committee in any way. This committee's main concern would be the field of manpower in scientific and engineering research and study.

Last week, President Eisenhower established a 19-man committee for the development of scientists and engineers. Some of our outstanding educators and laymen in industry, labor, science, education, and government will serve on

that Executive committee. The President, by his action, demonstrated that he is alert to the problems which I have outlined.

Now, it is up to the Congress to assume its share of responsibility and to use the type of vision and foresight which will insure that it will be able to meet its responsibility with maximum intelligence.

I have requested that the resolution be allowed to lay on the desk until the close of business next Friday, April 13, so that as many as care to may join in sponsoring this resolution.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I cannot commend too highly the Senator from Minnesota for introducing his joint resolution. Only a few weeks ago the president of the University of North Dakota, George W. Starcher, one of the ablest educators in America, speaking before the alumni meeting at that university, stated that in the State of North Dakota more than 1,000 high-school graduates are too poor to attend the University of North Dakota or any of the other institutions of learning within the borders of the State.

During the days of the drought, in the 1930's, Mr. President, the Board of Administration of North Dakota borrowed \$150,000 from the Bank of North Dakota and made it available to any poor students whose applications were approved by a committee of three and who wished to borrow money, up to \$300, for the purpose of attending college. The result was that approximately 1,200 students selected by the presidents of the various institutions of learning in North Dakota were enabled to attend various colleges in the State who otherwise would have been unable to attend, after graduating from high school.

Today, Mr. President, as I go over the State of North Dakota, in almost every city in the State I meet nurses, engineers, doctors, lawyers, or agriculturalists who, because of the money they were able to borrow, attended the university and graduated. The money thus obtained in connection with the money they earned enabled them to complete their college courses.

Mr. President, about a year ago I introduced a bill providing a revolving fund of \$1 billion to be made available to the Department of Education for the benefit of poor students throughout the United States of America, regardless of creed, religion, or nationality. That bill is still in committee. If that bill had been passed, it would have solved one of the problems mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. Who knows but that some poor boy or girl graduating from high school this year might have a chance to go to college and become another Thomas A. Edison, or an inventor or scientist equally as great, and render a tremendous service to the people of the United States?

I might add, Mr. President, that one of the poor students who, in the 1930's, took advantage of the \$300 loan, is now spoken of very favorably in the State of North Dakota for the office of Governor. His name is Arley Bjella, of Williston, N. Dak. He told me that, if it had not been for the loan which he was able to

obtain through the Board of Administration of the State of North Dakota, he could not have attended college. Today he is one of the outstanding lawyers of the State.

Again, Mr. President, I wish to commend my friend from Minnesota. It seems to me this action should have been taken a long time ago. Late as it is, it is a step in the right direction.

DEFINITION OF BANK HOLDING COMPANIES AND THEIR EXPANSION CONTROL—AMENDMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill (S. 2577) to define bank holding companies, control their future expansion, and require divestment of their nonbanking interests. I ask that the amendment be printed and lie on the table.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this very important amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with an editorial from the American Banker for March 27, 1956, and the Independent Bankers Credo for 1956 with names of supporting banks, from the same issue of the American Banker, both of which strongly state the reasons for the adoption of the amendment I am submitting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment, editorial, and Credo will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, editorial, and credo are as follows:

On page 8, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following new subsection:

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, no application shall be approved under this section which will permit any bank holding company or any subsidiary thereof to acquire, directly or indirectly, any voting shares of, interest in, or all or substantially all of the assets of any additional bank located outside of the State in which such bank holding company or subsidiary thereof maintains its principal office and place of business or in which it conducts its principal operations unless the acquisition of such shares or assets of a State bank by an out-of-State bank holding company is specifically authorized by the statute laws of the State in which such bank is located, by language to that effect and not merely by implication."

[From the American Banker of March 27, 1956]

VITAL VITALITY: INDEPENDENT BANKERS A FORCE FOR GOOD

The vitality of the Independent Bankers Association of America is the important news in American banking today.

Assembled in an even larger convention than last year's at Washington, the members at their 22d annual convention at New Orleans represent a powerful force for good in our dual banking system and for the future of our system of correspondent banking.

Their battle cry is one honored in American history, "Independence." They too want representation when laws affecting the future of banking are made. They march against our modern counterparts of monarchistic power and crown chartered corporations, today's concentrations of financial power and ever threatening drives toward monopoly. They believe in maximum local autonomy and home rule, and in States' rights.

Quite in the American tradition, therefore, is the philosophy of the independent banker.

The strength of that tradition is the real source of the growing membership and power of the Independent Bankers Association, and its west coast twin, the Independent Bankers Association of the 12th Federal Reserve District.

Consciousness that they bespeak traditional American philosophy lends courage to the fight these associations have been making for better banking and independent banking in our land.

There are those who quarrel with the independents' objectives; their right to do so is unquestionable.

But equal right devolves upon the independent unit bankers to muster their strength and present their case against branch banking trends, holding company practices that evade our laws restricting branch banking, tax-exempted competition and tax-subsidized Government lending agencies.

Right now, the major objective of the IBA is passage of an adequate Federal law to place group or chain banking under the same rules that have been enacted in the public interest to control the spread of branch banking. The problem has been with us in growing proportions for well over a half century.

A bit of history may be interesting as background.

A BIT OF HISTORY

Whether the First Security Co., organized as an affiliate of the old First National Bank of the city of New York, meant control of a nationwide chain of banks when it began purchasing blocks of stock of leading banks in major cities some 40 years ago, will probably never be known. But it is a fact that in 1911 the Solicitor General of the United States, Frederick Lehmann, took notice. He ruled that since it was unlawful for a national bank to own stock of another bank or operate a branch, it was therefore illegal to do so indirectly. Despite the vast wealth and power of the men behind the old First National, its security affiliate promptly divested itself of bank share holdings.

Senator Carter Glass, of Virginia, in 1932, declared himself shocked when he learned that this opinion existed but had never been applied to the early bank buying maneuvers with which the institutions were assembled to create the Giannini branch system in California despite opposition of other banks and of the State banking authorities, and also had never been invoked by the national banking authorities in regard to the group banking chains which sprang up in so many places in the 1920's, and which contributed so heavily to the bank failure record in the South in 1926, and all over the country in 1930-33. Senator Glass had the Lehmann opinion published in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 30, 1932.

Present-day parallels of the Lehmann opinion are the ruling of the attorney general of Texas about 2 years ago that affiliate banks violated the Texas law against branch banking, and also the laws passed in Illinois forbidding holding company bank ownership. Illinois, of course, has steadfastly prohibited branch banking in any form.

Today's most important question in banking is whether the holding company minority is strong enough to prevent enactment

of a Federal law to restrain their expansion on the same principles that limit branch bank expansion.

FIGHTING FOR PRINCIPLES

Why do the independent bankers believe they are upholding principles of sound banking and political philosophy? It is because they see how the building of intercity and interstate branch or bank chains offers such a quick and speculatively attractive way in booming times to attain financial power; and because such systems tend toward monopoly, and further, because concentration of the money and credit mechanism of the Nation in private hands invites socialization.

Simply stated, they believe that the locally owned and locally managed bank is a better and more responsive vehicle for administration of the money and credit power than vast aggregations of capital and branches owned and directed by absentees domiciled in a distant city.

Hence, the independent bankers give more than lip service to the distinctively American dual-banking system, and its unique pattern of closely knit independent correspondent banks.

And it is because of their vital interest in the health of our system that the independent bankers of America at New Orleans are deliberating this week on the problems of banking from the unit bank point of view. They will have their say not only on the holding company and branch banking issue, but also on what they believe is the unfairness of competition between tax-favored savings and loan associations and taxpaying banks, the development of better unit bank management methods and sounder banking policies, and the unwisdom of Government-subsidized loans.

We have our two independent bankers' associations because of the challenges which have risen affecting the future of the unit bank, and of American banking. The two organizations reflect the determination of the independent and smalltown bankers of America not to let drift, complacency and powerful minorities shape the future of American banking.

This week's meeting of the I. B. A. of A., in New Orleans, we can well predict, will be remembered in banking history for the vitality with which the independent bankers of the Nation are attacking the vital issues before them.

What these independents say and achieve will determine greatly the fate of the dual-banking system and correspondent banking in the United States.

[From the American Banker of March 27, 1956]

INDEPENDENT BANKERS CREDO FOR 1956

We believe in the American way.

We believe in the American ideal of independent banking.

We believe in first things first.

In the field of credit and banking, we support the principle of home rule and we respect the principle of States rights.

We oppose all trends which would lead away from these principles toward nationalization or socialization.

We are opposed, therefore, to the unrestricted expansion of multiple banking. Establishment of branches of chartered banks is subject to restriction in every State, and altogether prohibited in many of them by State law and concurrent Federal law. We hold that the local, State, and National interest is best served when banking control and expansion are subject to laws and to supervision designed to eliminate unsound developments.

Inasmuch as the bank holding company constitutes in fact a form of branch banking, the expansion of which is not subject to either Federal or State control, we believe

that legislation to halt unrestricted expansion of holding-company ownership of banks is the immediate need in defense of the American tradition of local banking autonomy, independent banking, unit banks, and States rights.

Further, banks are properly restricted to banking. So also should we restrict bank holding companies. The principle that banks refrain from engaging in business outside the field of banking is established in both State and National banking statutes. A bank is arbiter of the credit and is entrusted with the safekeeping of its community's funds; its objectives must not be confused or compromised by ownership of nonbanking types of business, which may well be competitors with its depositors and borrowers.

Independent banking is an American tradition. "Free banking" has been a watchword of free community development. Under its banner, the States have fought for their independent sovereign right to charter State banks, defending our dual system of banking against theorists who would concentrate all banking authority in the Nation in one central Federal agency. The national and independent State banks of our chartered system of free banks of today have survived all the economic storms and depressions of our past, thus demonstrating absolutely their continuing capacity to serve their communities with safety and with credit, locally administered for local development.

Money and credit are the lifeblood of industry and business. Their control should lie in the hands of those most responsive to the needs of the American people in their hometowns and States. The safety of the deposits entrusted by our people to our chartered system of banks should be in the hands of men accountable to their neighbors as well as to the State and National bank supervisors.

We know that when banking concentration expands without limit, and great nationwide chains of financial power can be created by ambitious men, the temptation of power-seeking governments to socialize them is great. History of dictator countries has shown how true this is.

Our system of free and independent banks has stood squarely athwart the intentions of the Socialists and planners who recognize with the Communists that a first step in taking away a people's economic freedom is to take away the freedom of their banks.

Independent banks, therefore, view with alarm the unrestricted way that the holding company has been able to evade the strict limitations which have been set upon branch banking in the national and in the State banking laws. We recall that in the speculative 1920's, financing holding companies were used as devices for building up top-heavy chains of banks to aggrandize the financial power of ambitious men. And that the subsequent collapses of certain of these unsupervised and loosely assembled holding-company systems in the 1930-33 period brought distress to millions, and pulled down with them scores of other banks. We urge legislative attention to close every loophole through which this might happen again.

The American banking system has been handed down to us by our banking forefathers as an American institution embodying the principles of free and independent administration of the funds of each local community for local development, subject only to such State and national supervision as our elected representatives deemed necessary.

We believe in first things first, and that the first item in the defense of independent banking and independent communities today is enactment now and without further delay of legislation that will end the un-

controlled status of the bank holding company, restrict it exclusively to banking, and forbid its expansion beyond the limitations which have been placed upon branch banking by Federal and State laws.

We view with great alarm any further delay in enacting bank holding company legislation. It is an invitation to expand banking chains where branch banking is prohibited. It is an open door to the acquisition of banking power outside the banking law. And it is our belief that this is neither desirable nor good for American banking nor for the American bank customer.

We are now in a crucial moment on holding company legislation. Our conviction is stronger than ever that the sound future of American banking makes enactment of the measures before Congress urged by independent bankers' associations mandatory.

This is our credo again for 1956. It is our statement of faith in the American way of liberty and fair play within the law, of freedom founded on principles of justice to which all can give consent.

Underwritten in behalf of the approximately 5,200 members of the Independent Bankers Association by the cooperating banks listed below:

Alabama: The Commercial National Bank of Anniston, Anniston; the Farmers & Merchants Bank, Ashford; Farmers & Merchants Bank, Centre; Bank of Dadeville, Dadeville; the First National Bank of Florence, Florence; Peoples Bank, Frisco City; Peoples Bank of Greensboro, Greensboro; the First National Bank of Guntersville, Guntersville; the First National Bank, Hartford; the First National Bank, Huntsville; Peterman State Bank, Peterman; Bank of Prattville, Prattville; Bank of Reform, Reform; Alabama Exchange Bank, City Bank, Tuskegee; the American National Bank of Union Springs, Union Springs; the First National Bank, Wetumpka; Winfield State Bank, Winfield.

Alaska: The B. M. Behrends Bank, Juneau; Matanurka Valley Bank, Palmer.

Arizona: The First National Bank, Holbrook; Farmers & Stockmen's Bank, Phoenix.

Arkansas: American State Bank, Charleston; the Merchants National Bank, Fort Smith; Farmers & Merchants Bank, Marianna; Merchants & Planters Bank, Warren.

California: Azusa Valley Savings Bank, the First National Bank, Azusa; Beverly Hills National Bank & Trust Co., Beverly Hills; the First National Bank of Dixon, Dixon; the First National Bank, La Verne; Farmers & Merchants Bank, Long Beach; the Farmers & Merchants National Bank, Los Angeles; the First National Bank of Monterey, Monterey; Oakland Bank of Commerce, Oakland; San Fernando Valley Commercial Bank, Pacoima; the First National Bank, Pleasanton; the Mechanics Bank of Richmond, Richmond; Salinas National Bank, Salinas; the Commercial National Bank of Santa Ana, Santa Ana; County National Bank & Trust Co., Santa Barbara; the Bank of Sierra Madre, Sierra Madre; Sun Valley National Bank of Los Angeles, Sun Valley; Security State Bank of Turlock, Turlock; the First National Bank, Vista; the Pajaro Valley National Bank, Watsonville; the First National Bank of Willows, Willows.

Colorado: The Moffat County State Bank, Craig; the Colorado Bank & Trust Co., Delta; the National City Bank, Denver; the First National Bank, Durango; the American State Bank, Granada; United States Bank of Grand Junction, Grand Junction; the First State Bank of Hotchkiss, Hotchkiss; the Colorado Savings & Trust Co., La Junta; the First National Bank, Las Animas; the First National Bank, Salida; the Routt County National Bank of Steamboat Springs, Steamboat Springs; the First National Bank, Strasburg.

Connecticut: The Black Rock Bank & Trust Co., Bridgeport; Danbury National Bank, Danbury; Groton Bank & Trust Co., Groton;

the Union Bank & Trust Co., New London; the Cargill Trust Co., Putnam; the Stratford Trust Co., Stratford.

Florida: The State Bank of Apopka, Apopka; Bank of Blountstown, Blountstown; the Bank of Bonifay, Bonifay; Gadsden County State Bank, Chattahoochee; Levy County State Bank, Chiefland; Peoples Bank of Crescent City, Crescent City; the Bank of Pasco County, Dade City; the Dania Bank, Dania; Commercial Bank of Daytona Beach, Daytona Beach; Bank of Everglades, Everglades; Citizens Bank of Frostproof, Frostproof; First National Bank of Hollywood, Hollywood; American National Bank of Jacksonville, Jacksonville; Peoples Bank of Lakeland, Lakeland; Lake Wales State Bank, Lake Wales; Pinellas Central Bank, Largo; the First National Bank of Leesburg, Leesburg; Pan American Bank of Miami, Riverside Bank, Miami; the Commercial Bank & Trust Co., Ocala; Bank of Pahokee, Pahokee; Citizens Bank & Trust Company of Quincy, the Quincy State Bank, Quincy; Union Trust Co., St. Petersburg; Gulf Beach Bank, St. Petersburg Beach; Capital City National Bank, Tallahassee; Citizens Bank, Titusville; Umatilla State Bank, Umatilla; the Valparaiso State Bank, Valparaiso; the Indian River Citrus Bank, Vero Beach; Bank of Wildwood, Wildwood; the First National Bank of Winter Garden, Winter Garden.

Georgia: The National Bank, Athens; East Atlanta Bank, the First National Bank, the Fulton National Bank, South Side Atlanta, Atlanta; Georgia Railroad Bank & Trust Co., Augusta; Austell Bank, Austell; Baxley State Bank, Baxley; the National Bank of Brunswick, Brunswick; the Citizens State Bank, Butler; Farmers and Merchants Bank, Coolidge; First State Bank in Cordele, Cordele; Bank of Covington & Trust Co., Covington; Granite City Bank, Elberton; the Bank of Heard County, Franklin; Jones County Bank, Haddock; Citizens Banking Co., Hartwell; the Pulaski Bank Co., Hawkinsville; the Hinesville Bank, Hinesville; the Brand Banking Co., First National Bank, Lawrenceville; State Bank, Leesburgh; Citizens Banking Co., Lexington; Bank of Manchester, Manchester; Bank of Millen, Millen; the Bank of Soperton, Soperton; Bulloch County Bank, Sea Island Bank, Statesboro; Farmers and Merchants Bank, Summerville; Commercial Bank, Thomasville; Bank of Villa Rica, Villa Rica; Citizens State Bank, Warner Robins; First National Bank, Waycross.

Idaho: Glenns Ferry Bank, Limited, Glenns Ferry; the Weber Bank, Kellogg; Largilliere Company Bankers, Soda Springs.

Illinois: Alton Banking & Trust Co., First National Bank & Trust Co. in Alton, Alton; Farmers State Bank, Beecher; First National Bank, Belleville; First National Bank, Bunker Hill; First Bank and Trust Co., Cairo; Canton State Bank, Canton; Capron State Bank, Capron; First National Bank of Carbondale, Carbondale; the Farmers & Merchants National Bank, Carlinville; the Charleston National Bank, Charleston; Beverly State Savings Bank, Chicago; Central National Bank in Chicago, Chatham Bank, Chicago National Bank, Citizens National Bank of Chicago, Commercial National Bank of Chicago, the District National Bank of Chicago, Marquette National Bank; State Bank of Cowden, Cowden; Home State Bank of Crystal Lake, Crystal Lake; State Bank of East Moline, East Moline; Union National Bank, East St. Louis; Edwardsville National Bank & Trust Co., Edwardsville; First National Bank in Fairbury, Fairbury; Fairview State Banking Co., Fairview; Granite City Trust & Savings Bank, Granite City; the First National Bank, Lacon; State Bank, Lombard; the Union National Bank of Macomb, Macomb; the Bank of Marion, Marion; Central National Bank of Mattoon, Mattoon; Mt. Carroll National Bank, Mt. Carroll; Mount Prospect State Bank, Mount Prospect, the first National Bank of Mt.

Pulaski, Mt. Pulaski; the City National Bank, Murphysboro; Oak Park Trust & Savings Bank, Oak Park; the First National Bank, O'Fallon; the Onley Trust & Banking Co., Onley; State Bank of Orion, Orion; the First National Bank, Ottawa; the Central National Bank & Trust Co., Jefferson Trust & Savings Bank of Peoria, South Side Trust & Savings Bank of Peoria, Peoria; Peotone State Bank, Peotone; First National Bank, Raymond; First Trust & Savings Bank, Riverdale; South Holland Trust & Savings Bank, South Holland; the Union National Bank of Streator, Streator; H. F. Gehant Banking Co., the Bank of West Frankfort, West Frankfort; Wheeling State Bank, Wheeling.

Indiana: First Bank of Berne, Berne; the First State Bank, Bourbon; the First State Bank, Decatur; the Etna Bank, Etna Green; First-Citizens Bank & Trust Co., Greencastle; State Bank, Lizton; Madison Bank & Trust Co., Madison; the First National Bank of Mays, Mays; the Floyd County Bank, New Albany; the Citizens State Bank, Newport; the Second National Bank, Richmond; Farmers & Merchants Bank of Rochester, Rochester; the State Bank of Waldron, Waldron; Bank of Whiting, Whiting; First Union Bank & Trust Co., Winamac.

Iowa: The First National Bank, Akron; First Trust & Savings Bank, Armstrong; First Trust & Savings Bank, Aurelia; Farmers State Bank, Charter Oak; the First National Bank, Clarion; Clear Lake Bank & Trust Co., Clear Lake; Clinton National Bank, Iowa State Savings Bank, Clinton; Iowa State Savings Bank, Creston; Crawford County Trust & Savings Bank, Denison; Central National Bank & Trust Co., Des Moines; State Bank of Dumont, Dumont; Iowa Trust & Savings Bank, Emmetsburg; the Emmet County State Bank, Iowa Trust & Savings Bank, Estherville; George State Bank, George; Peoples Trust & Savings Bank, Grand Junction; First National Bank, Hampton; Farmers State Bank, Hawarden; Peoples Trust & Savings Bank, Indianola; Iowa State Bank & Trust Co., Iowa City; Security Savings Bank, Ireton; State Bank of Lawler, Lawler; Commercial State Bank, Marshalltown; Nevada National Bank, Nevada; Taintor Savings Bank, New Sharon; Farmers Savings Bank, North English; the First National Bank of Oelwein, Oelwein; Northwestern State Bank, Orange City; Readlyn Savings Bank, Readlyn; Lyon County State Bank, Rock Rapids; Morning-side State Bank, Sioux City; Victor State Bank, Victor; Peoples Bank & Trust Co., Waterloo.

Kansas: The First National Bank, Columbus; the First State Bank of Elkhart, Elkhart; Ellis State Bank, Ellis; Citizens National Bank, Minneapolis; the Midland National Bank, Newton; State Bank of Parsons, Parsons; the First State Bank of Pittsburg, Pittsburg; Russell State Bank, Russell; the Farmers State Bank, Sabetha; Silver Lake State Bank, Silver Lake; the Merchants National Bank of Topeka, the State Savings Bank, Topeka; the Grant County State Bank, Ulysses; the Southwest National Bank, the Union National Bank, Wichita State Bank, Wichita; the First National Bank, Winfield.

Kentucky: The Third National Bank of Ashland, Ashland; the Royal Bank, Louisville; Bank of Middletown, Middletown; Citizens Bank & Trust Co., the Paducah Bank, Paducah.

Louisiana: Security National Bank, Alexandria; American Bank & Trust Co., Baton Rouge; Caddo Trust & Savings Bank, Belcher; the National Bank of Bossier City, Bossier City; Cottonport Bank, Cottonport; Bank of Commerce & Trust Co., Crowley; City Savings Bank & Trust Co., De Ridder; Tri-Parish Bank & Trust Co., Eunice; the St. Mary Bank & Trust Co., Franklin; Bank of Gonzales, Gonzales; the First National Bank of Jefferson Parish, Gretna; the First National Bank, Guaranty Bank & Trust Co.,

Lafayette; the First National Bank of Lake Charles, Lake Charles; Gulf National Bank, Lake Charles; Merchants & Farmers Bank & Trust Co., Leesville; Bank of Maringouin, Maringouin; Metairie Savings Bank & Trust Co., Metairie; Moreauville State Bank, Moreauville; the Citizens National Bank, Morgan City; Progressive Bank & Trust Co., New Orleans; Oil City Bank, Oil City; First State Bank, Plain Dealing; Bank of Commerce & Trust Co., St. Francisville; Springhill Bank & Trust Co., Springhill.

Maine: The First National Bank, Fort Kent; the Ocean National Bank, Kennebunk.

Maryland: The First National Bank of Cumberland, Cumberland; the First State Bank of Grantsville, Grantsville; Cecil National Bank, Port Deposit.

Massachusetts: The First National Bank of Amherst, Amherst; Gardner Trust Co., Gardner; the Merchants National Bank, Leominster; Malden Trust Co., Malden; the First National Bank of Marlboro, Marlboro; Home National Bank, Milford; Northampton National Bank, Northampton; the Orange National Bank, Orange; Tanners National Bank in Woburn, Woburn National Bank, Woburn; Guaranty Bank & Trust Co., Worcester.

Michigan: First State Bank, Alma; the Peoples State Bank, Alpena; Security National Bank, Battle Creek; the Jipson Carter State Bank, Blissfield; Bank of the Commonwealth, the Manufacturers National Bank of Detroit, Detroit; East Lansing State Bank, East Lansing; Citizens Commercial & Savings Bank, Flint; the State Bank of Fraser, Fraser; Gaylord State Bank, Gaylord; Grand Haven State Bank, Grand Haven; Old Kent Bank, Grand Rapids; Bank of Commerce, Peoples State Bank, Hamtramck; First Security Bank, Ionia; the Commercial National Bank of Ithaca, Ithaca; Bank of Lansing, American State Bank, Lansing; the First National Bank of Lapeer, Lapeer; Security Bank, Lincoln Park; Metamora State Savings Bank, Metamora; Milan State Bank, Milan; Plainwell Bank, Plainwell; River Rouge Savings Bank, River Rouge; the Roscommon State Bank, Roscommon; Commercial State Bank, Roseville; the Wayne Oakland Bank, Royal Oak; Second National Bank & Trust Co., Saginaw; the Peoples State Bank, St. Joseph; Central Savings Bank, Sault Ste. Marie; First-Peoples State Bank, Traverse City; the First National Bank, Watervliet; the National Bank of Wyandotte, Wyandotte.

Minnesota: Security State Bank of Albert Lea, Albert Lea; State Bank, Anoka; Farmers & Merchants State Bank, Appleton; Arlington State Bank, Arlington; Beaver Creek State Bank, Beaver Creek; North American State Bank, Belgrade; State Bank of Belle Plaine, Belle Plaine; Swift County Bank, Benson; Biwabik State Bank, Biwabik; Community State Bank, Bloomington; The First National Bank of Bovey, Bovey; Citizens State Bank of Brainerd, Brainerd; the First National Bank of Brewster, Brewster; State Bank of Bricelyn, Bricelyn; Union State Bank, Browns Valley; Security State Bank, Cannon Falls; Farmers & Merchants State Bank, Clarkfield; Columbia Heights State Bank, Columbia Heights; Detroit State Bank, Detroit Lakes; First State Bank of Dover, Dover; State Bank, Edgerton; First State Bank, Fertile; Security State Bank of Glencoe, Glencoe; Glenwood State Bank, Glenwood; The First National Bank, Good Thunder; Security State Bank, Hector; First National Bank, Le Roy; State Bank of Long Lake, Long Lake; The Bank of Long Prairie, Long Prairie; Citizens National Bank, Farmers State Bank of Madelia, Inc., Madelia; Melrose State Bank, Melrose; Marquette National Bank, Thirteenth Avenue State Bank of Minneapolis, Minneapolis; American State Bank of Moorhead, Moorhead; First State Bank of New Brighton, New Brighton; State Bank of New Richland, New Richland; Otisco State Bank, Otisco; The Security State Bank, Pine Island; The First National Bank, Pipestone; Farmers State Bank, Raymond;

Richfield State Bank, Richfield; Olmstead County Bank & Trust Company, Rochester; St. Clair State Bank, St. Clair; St. Cloud National Bank, St. Cloud; First State Bank of St. Joseph, St. Joseph; Citizens State Bank, St. Louis Park; Security State Bank of St. Michael, St. Michael; The American National Bank, Cherokee State Bank, St. Paul; First State Bank of Sauk Centre, Sauk Centre; The First National Bank, Shakopee; First National Bank of Starbuck, Starbuck; Northern State Bank of Thief River Falls, Thief River Falls; Triumph State Bank, Triumph; Peoples State Bank, Truman; Waldorf State Bank, Waldorf; Security State Bank, Warroad; Windom State Bank, Windom; The Winona National & Savings Bank, Winona; Citizens State Bank of Winsted, Winsted; State Bank of Wood Lake, Wood Lake.

Mississippi: Hancock Bank, Bay St. Louis; Canton Exchange Bank, Canton; Leflore Bank & Trust Co., Greenwood; Hancock Bank, Gulfport; Citizens Bank of Hattiesburg, Hattiesburg; Deposit Guaranty Bank & Trust Co., Jackson; Merchants & Farmers Bank, Kosciusko; the First National Bank of Laurel, Laurel; Magnolia Bank, Magnolia; Bank of Franklin, Meadville; Peoples Bank, Mendenhall; Bank of Morton, Morton; Bank of Pontotoc, Pontotoc; the First National Bank & Trust Co., Vicksburg; the Bank of West Point, West Point; The Bank of Yazoo City, Yazoo City.

Missouri: Arnold Savings Bank, Arnold; Polk County Bank, Bollivar; Farmers State Bank, Cameron; Fenton Bank, Fenton; New Era Bank, Fredericktown; Citizens Bank of Grant City, Grant City; Farmers & Merchants Bank, Green Ridge; the Bank of Houston, Houston; Irondale Bank, Irondale; Central Missouri Trust Co., Jefferson City; the Park National Bank of Kansas City, Kansas City; Citizens National Bank of Maplewood, Maplewood Bank & Trust Co., Maplewood; First National Bank, Mexico; Bank of Perryville, Home Trust Company, Perryville; Washington County Commercial Bank, Potosi; Bremen Bank & Trust Co., Easton-Taylor Trust Co., Gravois Bank, Lemay Bank & Trust Co., Manchester Bank of St. Louis, the Plaza Bank of St. Louis, St. Johns Community Bank, St. Louis; Third National Bank, Sedalia; the Citizens Bank, Springfield; State Bank & Trust Co. of Wellston, Wellston.

Montana: The First National Bank of Billings, Billings; Gallatin Trust and Savings Bank, Bozeman; Security Bank & Trust Co., Bozeman; the First National Bank, Browning; the Yellowstone Bank, Columbus; Farmers State Bank of Conrad, Conrad; Bank of Glacier County, Cut Bank; Deer Lodge Bank & Trust Co., Deer Lodge; First National Bank of Fairfield, Fairfield; the First National Bank, Geraldine; Montana Bank, Great Falls; Citizens State Bank, Hamilton; the Continental National Bank, Harlowton; Citizens Bank of Montana, Havre; the Conrad National Bank, Kalispell; the Yellowstone Bank, Laurel; the First National Bank, Missoula; Basin State Bank, Stanford.

Nebraska: The Commercial National Bank of Ainsworth, Ainsworth; First National Bank, Beemer; the First National Bank, Belden; the Commercial Bank, Blue Hill; Bank of Brule, Brule; Bruning State Bank, Bruning; the First National Bank, Falls City; Bank of Hartington, Hartington; Harvard State Bank, Harvard; Farmers State Bank, Kilgore; the First National Bank of Lincoln, National Bank of Commerce of Lincoln, Lincoln; First National Bank of Newman Grove, Newman Grove; Platte Valley Bank, North Bend; Douglas County Bank of Omaha, First National Bank of Omaha, the Omaha National Bank, Omaha; Nebraska State Bank, Ord; the American National Bank of Sidney, Sidney National Bank, Sidney; Farmers State Bank, Superior; Johnson County Bank, Tecumseh; the First National Bank of

Tekamah, Tekamah; the First National Bank of Wahoo, Wahoo.

Nevada: The First National Bank of Ely, Ely.

New Hampshire: First National Bank of Concord, Concord; Siwooganock Guaranty Savings Bank, Lancaster; the Littleton National Bank, Littleton; Pemigewasset National Bank, Plymouth; Savings Bank of Walpole, Walpole.

New Jersey: Bank of Bogota, Bogota; Bound Brook Trust Co., Bound Brook; the Branchville National Bank, Branchville; the Edgewater National Bank, Edgewater; Union County Trust Co., Elizabeth; First National Bank in Garfield, Garfield Trust Co., Garfield; Peoples Bank of Hawthorne, Hawthorne; the Hillsdale National Bank, Hillsdale; Keansburg National Bank, Keansburg; the Leonia Bank & Trust Co., Leonia; Linden Trust Co., Linden; the Maplewood Bank & Trust Co., Maplewood; the Millville National Bank, Millville; the First National Bank & Trust Co., Paulsboro; First Bank & Trust Co., Perth Amboy; the State Trust Company at Plainfield, Plainfield; Ridgefield Park Trust Co., Ridgefield Park; Riverside Trust Co., Riverside; Rutherford Trust Co., Rutherford; Citizens Trust Co., Summit; Swedesboro Trust Co., Swedesboro; the Union Center National Bank, Union; the First National Bank of Westwood, Westwood; the Woodridge National Bank, Woodridge.

New Mexico: First National Bank in Albuquerque, Albuquerque; the First National Bank, Belen; American Bank of Carlsbad, Carlsbad; the Carlsbad National Bank, Carlsbad; the Farmers & Stockmens Bank, Clayton; the Portales National Bank, Portales; First State Bank of Taos, Taos.

New York: The First National Bank, Addison; the Evans National Bank of Angola, Angola; the Citizens Bank, Arcade; the First National Bank and Trust Co., Bay Shore; the Industrial Bank, Binghamton; The Gramatan National Bank & Trust Co., Bronxville; the Peoples National Bank of Brooklyn, Brooklyn; the St. Lawrence County National Bank, Canton; Peninsula National Bank, Cedarhurst; Hayes National Bank, Clinton; Dundee State Bank, Dundee; Erie County Trust Co., East Aurora; Endicott Trust Co., Endicott; the Bank of LeRoy, LeRoy; Citizens State Bank, Lyndonville; the Massena Banking & Trust Co., Massena; the National Union Bank of Monticello, Monticello; Nanuet National Bank, Nanuet; State Bank of Newfane, Newfane; Royal State Bank of New York, New York; the Bank of North Collins, North Collins; the Exchange National Bank, Olean; the Oneida Valley National Bank of Oneida, Oneida; the Red Creek National Bank, Red Creek; the First National Bank, Richfield Springs; Salamanca Trust Co., Salamanca; the Silver Creek National Bank, Silver Creek; the First National Bank, Wayland.

North Carolina: Haywood County Bank, Canton; Durham Industrial Bank, Durham; the Fidelity Bank, Durham; the Citizens Bank, Warrenton.

North Dakota: First National Bank, Bottineau; the Ramsey National Bank of Devils Lake, Devils Lake; the Liberty National Bank, Dickinson; Security State Bank, Dunseith; the Fargo National Bank, Fargo; Walsh County State Bank, Grafton; First State Bank, Harvey; Citizens State Bank, Lankin; the First National Bank, Linton; the First State Bank of Munich, Munich; Stock Growers Bank, Napoleon; Security State Bank, Robinson; Farmers and Merchants Bank, Sheyenne; State Bank of Streeter, Streeter; First International Bank, Watford City; Farmers and Merchants Bank, Wimbeldon.

Ohio: The Amsterdam State Bank Co., Amsterdam; the Farmers National Bank, Canfield; the Peoples Bank Co., Carey; Market Exchange Bank, Columbus; the Citizens Bank, Degraff; the Genoa Banking Co.,

Genoa; the Holgate State Bank, Holgate; the First National Bank, Ironton; the Johnstown Bank, Johnstown; the Firestone Bank, Lisbon; the Farmers Exchange Bank, Lynchburg; the First National Bank of Miamisburg, Miamisburg; the Sterling State Bank, Mount Sterling; the First National Bank of Newcomerstown, Newcomerstown; the Peoples Savings Bank, New Matamoras; the Citizens Banking Co., Perrysburg; the Farmers National Bank, Plain City; the First National Bank, Salem; the Silverton Bank, Silverton; the Miners and Mechanics Savings & Trust Co., Steubenville; the Farmers Savings Bank, Stony Ridge; the Peoples Bank, Tiltonsville; the Wakeman Bank Co., Wakeman; the Washington Savings Bank, Washington Court House; the Woodville State Bank, Woodville.

Oklahoma: The Atoka State Bank, Atoka; the Farmers National Bank, Carnegie; the First State Bank, Ketchum; the First National Bank of Minco, Minco; the First National Bank & Trust Co., Muskogee; the Eastman National Bank, Newkirk; First National Bank in Perry, Perry; the Stillwater National Bank, Stillwater; the First National Bank, Tahlequah; the National Bank, Verdun; the First National Bank, Yale.

Oregon: First State Bank, Milwaukie; Bank of St. Helens, St. Helens; Commercial Bank of Salem, Salem.

Pennsylvania: Apollo Trust Co., Apollo; the Farmers National Bank, Beaver Falls; the First National Bank of Bellefonte, Bellefonte; the First National Bank of Berwick, Berwick; the National Bank, Boyertown; Bank of Brentwood, Brentwood; Delaware Valley Bank & Trust Co., Farmers National Bank, Bristol; the Bryn Mawr Trust Co., Bryn Mawr; the First National Bank, Claysburg; the Conyngham National Bank, Conyngham; the Denver National Bank, Denver; the First National Bank at Derry, Derry; the First National Bank, Ebensburg; Elizabethtown Trust Co., Elizabethtown; the Ephrata National Bank, Ephrata; the Citizens National Bank of Evans City, Evans City; First National Bank, Export; Forty Fort State Bank, Forty Fort; the Old Freeport Bank, Freeport; First National Bank, Greensburg; the Grove City National Bank, Grove City; the Bank of Hartsville, Hartsville; the Hatfield National Bank & Trust Co., Hatfield; the Imperial Bank, Imperial; the Dale National Bank, Johnstown; National Bank & Trust Co., Kennett Square; the National Bank of McKeesport, McKeesport; Merchants National Bank & Trust Co., Meadville; the First National Bank, Milton; the First & Farmers National Bank & Trust Co., Montrose; Muncy Banking Co., Muncy; Beaver County Trust Co., New Brighton; the New Tripoli National Bank, New Tripoli; Citizens Bank of Pleasantville, Pleasantville; the First National Bank, Reynoldsville; McDowell National Bank, Sharon; Smithfield State Bank, Smithfield; First Blair County National Bank, Tyrone; Upper Darby National Bank, Upper Darby; the First National Bank of Wellsborough, Wellsboro; Williamsport National Bank, Williamsport.

South Carolina: Farmers & Merchants Bank, Aiken; the Bank of Barnwell, Barnwell; Guaranty Bank & Trust Co., Florence; the County Bank, Greenwood; Bank of Greer, Greer; Palmetto Bank & Trust Co., Lake City; Palmetto Bank, Laurens; the Southern National Bank, Orangeburg; Peoples Bank & Trust Co., Pageland; Bank of Ridgeland, Ridgeland; Arthur State Bank, Union.

South Dakota: The First National Bank, Beresford; Burke State Bank, Burke; Custer County Bank, Custer; the Bank of Union County, Elk Point; Corn Exchange Bank, Elkton; the Farmers State Bank, Estelline; Community Bank, Hartford; Bank of Hoven, Hoven; Exchange Bank, Lennox; Menno State Bank, Menno; First National Bank, the Pierre National Bank, Pierre; Sioux Valley Bank, Union Savings Bank, Sioux Falls;

Roberts County National Bank, Sisseton; Farmers State Bank, Stickney; Commercial State Bank, Wagner; Wilmot State Bank, Wilmot.

Tennessee: Bank of Adamsville, Adamsville; First National Bank, Athens; Brighton Savings Bank, Brighton; Bank of Camden, Camden; the Ridgedale Bank & Trust Co., Chattanooga; Cleveland Bank & Trust Co., Cleveland; Union Peoples Bank, Clinton; the Middle Tennessee Bank, Columbia; Cottage Grove Bank & Trust Co., Cottage Grove; Citizens Bank, Elizabethton; Bank of Knoxville, Knoxville; Blount National Bank, Maryville; Farmers-Peoples Bank, Milan; Third National Bank in Nashville, Nashville; Merchants & Planters Bank, Newport; First Trust & Savings Bank, Oneida; the Union Bank, Pulaski; the Rutherford Bank, Rutherford.

Texas: Security State Bank & Trust Co., Beaumont; First National Bank, Borger; Citizens National Bank, Brownwood; College Station State Bank, College Station; The First National Bank, Commerce; The Love Field State Bank, Republic National Bank of Dallas, Dallas; Del Rio National Bank, Del Rio; First State Bank, Dumas; Commercial State Bank, El Campo; Farmers and Merchants State Bank, Ferris; The First State Bank, Gainesville; Haskell National Bank, Haskell; Houston Bank & Trust Co., Texas National Bank, Houston; The First National Bank, LaFeria; The Farmers State Bank, Mexia; The First National Bank, Midland; Muenster State Bank, Muenster; The First National Bank of Navasota, Navasota; First National Bank, Orange; First National Bank, Pampa; Pasadena State Bank, Pasadena; Hale County State Bank, Plainview; First State Bank & Trust Co., Rio Grande City; Silsbee State Bank, Silsbee; Union State Bank, South San Antonio; The First State Bank, Taft; The Citizens National Bank, Waco; Wharton Bank & Trust Co., Wharton; The Wolfe City National Bank, Wolfe City; The First National Bank, Woodsboro.

Utah: The First National Bank, Layton; State Bank of Provo, Provo; First National Bank of Salt Lake City, Salt Lake City; Springville Banking Co., Springville.

Vermont: Bradford National Bank, Bradford; Vermont-Peoples National Bank, Brattleboro.

Virginia: First National Bank, Ashland; the Bank of Colonial Heights, Colonial Heights; the First National Bank, Farmville; Vaughan & Co., bankers, Franklin; the Citizens National Bank, Hampton; Farmers & Merchants Bank, Lawrenceville; the National Bank of Manassas, Manassas; Citizens Marine Jefferson Bank, Newport News; Merchants & Planters Bank, Southern Bank of Norfolk, Norfolk; Bank of Norview, Norview; the National Bank, Orange; Bank of Giles County, Pearisburg; Lee Bank & Trust Co., Pennington Gap; Petersburg Savings & American Trust Co., Petersburg; Merchants & Farmers Bank, Portsmouth; Mechanics & Merchants Bank, Richmond; American Bank & Trust Co., National Bank of Suffolk, Suffolk; the Vienna Trust Co., Vienna.

Washington: the Citizens State Bank, Arlington; the Bellingham National Bank, Bellingham; Bothell State Bank, Bothell; Cashmere Valley Bank, Cashmere; the First National Bank, Enumclaw; First National Bank in Montesano, Montesano; Olympia State Bank & Trust Co., Olympia; the First National Bank, Pullman; Citizens State Bank, Puyallup; Skagit Valley State Bank, Sedro Woolley; North Pacific Bank, the Puget Sound National Bank of Tacoma, United Mutual Savings Bank, Tacoma; the Baker-Boyer National Bank, Walla Walla.

West Virginia: the Flat Top National Bank, Bluefield; Bank of Charles Town, Charles Town; Nicholas County Bank, Summersville.

Wisconsin: The Second National Bank, Beloit; the Indianhead State Bank, Chetek; Dairymen's State Bank, Clintonville; The First National Bank, Elkhorn; the First

State Bank, Fennimore; First Bank of Grantsburg, Grantsburg; Farmers and Merchants Bank, Greenwood; Iron Exchange Bank, Hurley; Rock County National Bank, Janesville; Exchange State Bank, La Crosse; Lancaster State Bank, Lancaster; the American Exchange Bank, Madison; State Bank of Medford, Medford; West Side Bank, Whitefish Bay State Bank, Milwaukee; the Oshkosh National Bank, Oshkosh; Peshtigo State Bank, Peshtigo; the Port Washington State Bank, Port Washington; Farmers-Merchants National Bank, Princeton; State Bank, Reeseville; St. Nazianz State Bank, St. Nazianz; Bank of Two Rivers, Two Rivers; Union State Bank of West Salem, West Salem.

Wyoming: The Casper National Bank, the Wyoming National Bank of Casper, Casper; the Stock Growers National Bank, Cheyenne; Stockmens Bank, Gillette; the Jackson State Bank, Jackson.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER:

Address delivered by him on April 3, 1956, before Knights of Columbus in Silver Spring, Md., with relation to the 1956 Olympic games.

Statement by him commemorating anniversary of independence of Greece.

Address by Senator MARTIN before Port of Philadelphia Maritime Society, at Philadelphia, Pa., on March 22, 1956.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS OF FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF VARIOUS CLASSES

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Senate received today a list of nominations of persons for appointment as foreign service officers of various classes, consular and/or diplomatic designations for career, staff, and Reserve officers, and one promotion. As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations I desire to give notice that these nominations will be considered by the committee at the expiration of 6 days.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 29, RELATING TO THE QUALIFICATIONS OF ELECTORS AND SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 39, RELATING TO EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, April 11, 1956, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on Senate Joint Resolution 29, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the qualifications of electors, and Senate Joint Resolution 39, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the

proposed legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGSEN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and myself, chairman.

FOURTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FALL OF BATAAN

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed for not more than 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from California may proceed for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Today is Bataan Day, the 14th anniversary of the fall of the historic bastion of freedom in the Philippines. It was a bitter defeat. Yet Bataan has become a synonym of courage and honor. As President Magsaysay observed in setting aside the day as a national holiday, Bataan "has become a shining symbol of courage and heroism to all freedom-loving peoples of the world."

Americans can take special pride in this commemoration of Bataan Day. It marked a military failure, it is true, but it gave us a valuable lesson in how to establish abiding relationship between free peoples. Again I should like to quote President Magsaysay:

"Bataan Day," he said, "has strengthened the everlasting bonds of friendship and cooperation between the Philippines and the United States."

Mr. President, in today's New York Times there appears a very fine editorial, which I should like to quote at this point in my remarks. The editorial, which is entitled "Bataan Day" reads:

BATAAN DAY

Today's observance of Bataan Day in the Philippines and in the United States has some unusual aspects. There is probably not such another political and military commemoration that is noted jointly by two separate nations. It is a national holiday in the Philippines. It might well be one here.

This is also a celebration, not of a military victory, but of a defeat. This is an anniversary of the loss of Bataan to the Japanese. It is not, however, a memorial service nor an occasion for mourning. It is a day of triumph.

What Bataan Day means both there and here is that somehow in the flames of war there was forged a bond between Filipinos and Americans that is worth remembering and celebrating. We were brothers in arms. We were comrades in disaster. We are associates in the new freedom.

What made the joint effort on Bataan possible, and what makes the celebration of this day meaningful, is the fact that we and the Filipinos were joined in the good cause of human liberty. That liberty was threatened by an invader and we and the Filipinos stood side by side to resist the threat. In that moment we were overwhelmed and suffered together. But out of that experience there arose the new sense of comradeship, mutual faith, and mutual loyalty that we celebrate today.

There have been ripples of antagonism on the surface of our association since that time. They are just that, neither a tide nor the deeps that lie beneath. They, too, will

pass, just as the horrors of Bataan have become a memory.

Today is a day for mutual understanding, for deeper sympathy. We remember and honor our glorious dead. We fought in one cause, for one goal. That goal can be realized if we keep faith with those who died on the peninsula.

It is fitting, therefore, that we in our own country observe Bataan Day as a milestone in the unbroken continuity of mankind's march toward human dignity and freedom.

This anniversary of the fall of Bataan finds Americans and Filipinos united in resistance to a new form of tyranny, a godless ideology that is unmoral and ruthless, that recognizes neither faith nor ethics, that enslaves the human mind and soul.

We are witnessing a struggle between freedom and slavery, between democracy and totalitarianism. At stake today, as it was 14 years ago, is human liberty and the dignity of the individual. In this struggle our Filipino friends are fighting shoulder to shoulder with us, just as they did on Bataan, in Leyte, and in Korea.

It is well that we should draw inspiration from the courage of the defenders of Bataan, American and Filipino, who fought aggression more by their physical and spiritual courage rather than with material resources, of which they had very little. Not only do we salute the living and the dead for their sacrifice, but we learn from their stirring example the fortitude and the determination we have to muster to face the future, and successfully fight our enemies of today.

May our Nation and the world recall today that last broadcast from Corregidor by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, then a lieutenant colonel on MacArthur's staff—that unforgettable message of hope and valor which now, as it did then, should galvanize free men into action in defense of their threatened liberties everywhere. General Romulo said:

Bataan has fallen, but the spirit that made it stand—a beacon to all liberty-loving peoples of the world—cannot fail.

The spirit which made Bataan stand is the invincible might that alone can safeguard world peace today. It is this spirit that assures the maintenance of a free world of free men, despite the temporary gains which totalitarian systems—Nazi, Fascist, Communist, or any other—may make.

FINAL REPORT OF COMMITTEE FOR THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, last Friday, April 6, the final report of the Committee for the White House Conference on Education was presented to President Eisenhower.

The committee recommended a temporary emergency program of Federal aid for public school construction, for a 5-year period, on a matching basis. The committee urged that such aid be given in such a way that the States and local school districts would be encouraged to make use of their own resources, and that States which have really made an

effort to solve their own problem not be penalized.

On January 12 I introduced on behalf of myself and 17 colleagues S. 2905, the administration's school construction bill.

So far, no action has been taken by the Senate on this important measure.

The principles set forth in S. 2905 have now been supported in this final report.

On Saturday, April 7, the New York Times carried an editorial entitled "School Report."

The final paragraph of that editorial reads as follows:

The most practical way of implementing the general philosophy and some of the particular recommendations of the committee is to push for action on the President's school-aid bill. It will need every ounce of strength the administration can muster to get it through and get it through without irrelevant or destructive amendments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this entire editorial be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

I hope that with this final White House conference report as an impetus, all of us will in the coming weeks increase our efforts, in a bipartisan manner, to see that a school-construction bill receives the prompt consideration of the Senate.

We cannot afford to postpone action on this crucially important subject any longer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOOL REPORT

The final report growing out of last fall's White House Conference on Education gives a striking picture of the present state of the public schools and provides firm ground for a new and vigorous drive to get the President's school-aid bill through Congress during the current session.

The overwhelming majority of the President's committee found no doubt that a school-building emergency exists, and that Federal aid should be made available on a limited basis to help the States and local school districts overcome that emergency. At the same time the committee urged that Federal money be provided "under the philosophy of encouraging greater use of State and local funds for school purposes" and that each State and district be required "to match Federal funds in proportion to its financial ability." This is a point of view with which we fully agree, and it is embodied in the administration's school-aid bill on which the House of Representatives for many weeks has failed to take action.

The committee found not only that "a few States are so lacking in economic ability that they cannot finance an adequate system of public education * * *" but also that the emergency "is so extensive that no State or Territory escapes it." This is not to say that some States and districts cannot do a great deal better than they are doing. Indeed, they can, and it may surprise some complacent northerners to know that the least effort, as measured by the ratio of total income to expenditure on schools, appears to be in the North and not in the South.

The committee took no definitive position on the highly controversial subject of Federal help for operation, as distinct from construction, of schools. It said the extent to which public funds should be expended in providing basic health and safety services for nonpublic (parochial) schools should be locally determined. On the even more touchy segregation issue, it endorsed a solution "worked out by each community in its own

way" but "within the intent" of the Supreme Court decisions.

The most practical way of implementing the general philosophy and some of the particular recommendations of the committee is to push for action on the President's school-aid bill. It will need every ounce of strength the administration can muster to get it through and get it through without irrelevant or destructive amendments.

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATIVE ACTION AS OF MARCH 31, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a summary of the legislative action of the Senate as of March 31, 1956.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE ACTION AS OF MARCH 31, 1956

The Senate has been far more active in the second session of the Democratic-controlled 84th Congress than it was during the comparable sessions of either the 83d or the 80th Congress, both controlled by the Republican Party.

Through March 31 of this session, the Senate has passed a total of 423 pieces of legislation. That compares with 222 bills passed by the Senate during the first 3 months of 1954 and with 301 passed by the Senate during the first 3 months of the second session of the 80th Congress.

At the end of March, the Senate had been in session a total of 355 hours. The score was 304 hours in session during the first 3 months of 1954 and only 227 hours during the comparable period of 1948.

The box score in full follows:

Senate activity—2d sessions of 84th, 83d, 80th Congress, as of March 31, 1956

| | 84th Cong., 2d sess. | 83d Cong., 2d sess. | 80th Cong., 2d sess. |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Days in session..... | 55 | 56 | 50 |
| Hours in session..... | 355:58 | 304:03 | 227:42 |
| Total measures passed..... | 423 | 222 | 301 |
| Senate bills..... | 164 | 82 | 127 |
| House bills..... | 164 | 84 | 121 |
| Senate joint resolutions..... | 7 | 3 | 8 |
| House joint resolutions..... | 11 | 5 | 5 |
| Senate concurrent resolutions..... | 11 | 8 | 4 |
| House concurrent resolutions..... | 4 | 4 | 11 |
| Senate resolutions..... | 62 | 46 | 25 |
| Confirmations..... | 24,366 | 8,412 | 4,612 |

Below is a subject list of the 127 general legislative measures passed as of March 31, 1956.

AGRICULTURE

1. H. R. 12, the farm bill: a bill to provide an improved farm program, and including a soil-bank provision.

2. H. R. 8780, the farm gasoline bill: relieves farmers from paying excise taxes on gasoline and fuels used on the farm, and directs a refund of taxes paid on such gasoline in 1956.

3. H. R. 1855, forest research: authorizes a permanent program of United States contribution to specialized forest, range, and watershed research.

4. H. R. 7236, soil conservation: authorizes Federal assistance in soil-conservation programs to farmers in all areas, not merely arid sections of the United States.

5. H. R. 1726, Federal Seed Act: provides a civil action for violation of the analysis and labeling provisions of the act.

6. H. R. 7030, Sugar Act: extending to December 31, 1962, the legislation under which domestic and imported sugar is controlled in

the United States. Modifies the distribution formula for increased sugar requirements as between domestic and foreign producers and among foreign producers.

7. S. 2884, durum wheat: extends to the 1956 durum wheat crop the increased acreage allotment provided for 1955.

8. H. R. 8320, school milk-brucellosis programs: authorizes an additional \$10 million for the school-milk program, or from \$50 million to \$60 million; and \$2 million for the brucellosis program or from \$15 million to \$17 million through June 30, 1956.

9. S. 1688, prescribes civil penalties for violations of the Federal Seed Act.

10. House Joint Resolution 455, restores the 1955 acreage allotments on burley tobacco quotas.

11. House Joint Resolution 521, restores the 1955 acreage allotments on Maryland tobacco.

12. House Joint Resolution 518 restores the 1955 acreage allotments on dark air-cured and fire-cured tobacco.

APPROPRIATIONS

13. H. R. 9063, urgent deficiency for 1956, appropriating \$64,670,201.

14. H. R. 9064, Treasury-Post Office Appropriation Act for 1957, appropriating \$3,629,139,000.

15. House Joint Resolution 582, authorizing an additional \$13 million for unemployment compensation for Federal employees, to be derived from transfer from the appropriation for unemployment compensation for veterans, 1956.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

16. H. R. 6574, motor-vehicle registration plates, reestablishes the former fee of \$1 for the transfer of motor-vehicle registration plates from one vehicle to another during the course of a registration year in the District of Columbia.

17. H. R. 9770, Federal contribution, authorizes the annual payment by the Federal Government to be increased \$3 million toward the cost of operating the District of Columbia government for fiscal 1957 and for each fiscal year thereafter.

18. S. 3053 extends to May 1, 1956, the time for the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission to submit its report and recommendations regarding construction of a District of Columbia civic auditorium.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

19. S. 1135, Civil Air Patrol, extends the benefits of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to senior CAP members.

20. H. R. 8107, Reserve Act amendment, equalizes the pay scales of reservists called to 6-month training duty with those of National Guard members and provides increased medical and disability benefits.

21. S. 3237, life-insurance coverage, continues coverage under Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act for employees receiving benefits under the Compensation Act so long as the employee is unable to return to work.

22. S. 3315, reemployment requirement: Makes the 1-year reemployment requirement inapplicable to civil servants who die before that year is served, in establishing survivor's benefits.

23. S. 1542, notaries public: Authorizes reimbursement of notaries' fees for Government employees who become notaries for the convenience of the Government.

24. H. R. 3996, Military Personnel Claims Act: Increases from \$2,500 to \$4,000 the limit on administrative settlement under the act.

FINANCE, COMMERCE, INDUSTRY—INCLUDES TAXATION

25. H. R. 7201, life insurance company tax: Establishes new system of taxing income of life insurance companies; reforms tax laws on investments by life insurance companies; and amends the law regarding new insurance companies.

26. H. R. 6712, tax revision: Amends section 1237 of the code to afford capital gains treatment to corporations or individuals holding foreclosed land for 10 years, subdividing and selling, unless as part of a real-estate trading business.

27. H. R. 2667, Internal Revenue Code: Makes effective December 31, 1947 (now 1950) the estate-tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which provide that there shall not be included in a decedent's estate, property previously transferred in trust as to which the decedent retained certain discretionary powers if for at least 3 months prior to December 31, 1947, and up to his death he was under a mental disability.

28. H. R. 4376, duty free: Adds to the free list of the 1930 Tariff Act handwoven fabrics imported by religious societies for use in making vestments.

29. H. R. 4582, amends the 1954 Internal Revenue Code, section 381 (c), to permit parent corporations acquiring subsidiary corporations under the 1939 Revenue Code under tax-free liquidations or mergers to deduct from gross income the unused contributions of the subsidiary to pension funds.

30. H. R. 5428, amends the Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that where a transferee or fiduciary by agreement waives the statute of limitations for the assessment of additional income taxes, the statutory period for credits or refunds shall be similarly extended.

31. H. R. 7054, amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide an election for executors of a credit against the estate tax for the amount of tax paid on property which passed to the decedent from a spouse who died within 2 years prior to the decedent's death.

32. H. R. 7094, amends the 1939 code to allow for all taxable years governed by that code an unlimited charitable deduction where in 8 of the 10 preceding years the individual's contributions to charity and his income tax payments are equal to 90 percent or more of his taxable income.

33. H. R. 7247, adds to the 1954 Revenue Code a new section which provides for the recognition of no gain in the recapitalization of a railroad corporation under the bankruptcy laws or in receivership proceedings where the property of a transferor corporation is exchanged solely for securities or stock of the transferee.

34. H. R. 7282, amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that in the computation of credits allowable for corporate dividends received, dividends paid and Western Hemisphere trade corporations, corporations in determining their adjusted net income shall include their net long-term capital gain income even though it may have been subject to the alternative 25-percent tax rate.

35. H. R. 7364, amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the stamp tax the issuance of debt certificates sold under installment arrangements whereby the obligee may not pay more than 20 percent annually of the total maturity value.

36. H. R. 8166, provides a 1-year extension of the present corporate income tax rate and the existing rates of certain excises, which were scheduled for reduction on April 1, 1956.

37. S. 3091, sale of Louisville, Ky., rubber plant and butadiene producing equipment.

38. H. R. 5265, foreign travel tax: exempts from the 10-percent excise tax on transportation of persons, travel to or from a point outside the United States, or that part of Canada and Mexico which is more than 225 miles from the United States.

FOREIGN RELATIONS

39. S. 3116, cultural and athletic exchanges: Provides a permanent program for United States participation in international cultural, athletic, and industrial fairs.

40. Executive Q, 83d, 1st, treaty, commercial samples: Ratified the international convention to facilitate importation of commercial advertising samples.

41. H. R. 8100, submarines to Brazil: Authorizes the loan of two reserve submarines to Brazil, for 5 years, and authorizes MDAP payment of outfitting costs.

42. S. 2562, Fulbright scholars: Amends the act to require of exchange students a return to their home country, or to a co-operating country for 2 years, before they become eligible for naturalization.

43. Executive F: Transfers to the U. N. procedural functions formerly performed by the League of Nations.

44. Executive P: Ratifying a protocol modifying the International Customs Convention, to permit the Bureau to increase its maximum budget from 125,000 gold francs to 500,000 gold francs and increases assessments of members.

45. House Joint Resolution 464, permits duty-free importation of articles exhibited at the State of Washington International Fair.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

46. S. 1146, removes requirement that reasonableness of attorney's fees, in regard to claims under Trading With the Enemy Act, be passed on by Alien Property Office.

47. Senate Joint Resolution 95, authorizes the American Battle Monuments Commission to prepare plans and estimates for the erection of a suitable memorial to Gen. John J. Pershing, and to make its recommendations on the site and design to Congress as early as practicable.

48. H. R. 6904, establishes a public national memorial for Booker T. Washington, who, through prodigious efforts and many great contributions to his people and all mankind, was elected to the Hall of Fame.

49. H. R. 3557, settling claims against the United States: Amends the act providing for claims up to \$1,000 resulting from non-combat injury or damage by extending the statute of limitations to 2 years, broadening circumstances covered by the act, etc.

50. H. R. 6463, Hawaiian lands: Ratifies certain acts of the Hawaiian Legislature, giving abutting property owners preference rights to small tracts of lands.

51. H. R. 6807, Hawaiian lands: Provides for relaxation of certain restrictive covenants on former public lands.

52. H. R. 6808, Hawaiian lands: Provides for a second private sale of public lands after initial auction, at not less than the advertised price.

53. H. R. 6461, Hawaiian lands: Provides for the mandatory inclusion of Government-sold lands in irrigation projects, and assessments therefor.

54. H. R. 5844, passport applications: Increased the fee for executing an application for a passport from \$1 to \$3.

55. H. R. 8191, New Zealand paintings: Authorized the donation to New Zealand of 25 World War II paintings of New Zealand soldiers, done by German artists.

56. Senate Joint Resolutions 122, 123, 124, to provide for filling of 3 separate vacancies in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of class other than Members of Congress.

57. House Joint Resolution 517, date of electoral vote count: Establishes January 1, 1957, as the date for counting electoral votes, January 6 falling on Sunday.

58. H. R. 1806, Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association: Authorizes consolidation of Theodore Roosevelt Association with Women's Theodore Roosevelt Association.

59. S. 3386, Theodore Roosevelt Centennial: Authorizes an additional \$461,000 for the Commission for Celebration of 100th Anniversary of Theodore Roosevelt's birth.

60. H. R. 6112, Colonial Historical Park: Authorizes construction of a sewage disposal system in the park, with some private users paying.

61. H. R. 6022, Trenton Massacre Monument: Authorizes movement of the Monument to a more convenient location nearby.

62. H. R. 5280, Colonial Historical Park: Authorizes certain land exchanges for the park.

63. H. R. 4391, Castle Pinckney Monument: Abolishes the Castle Pinckney National Monument, S. C., and authorizes disposal of the land as surplus Federal property.

64. H. R. 374, Stanislaus Forest: Authorizes the exchange of deeds to 440 acres in the Stanislaus National Forest, Calif., for 440 acres contiguous thereto, to cure defects in the two deeds.

65. S. 1161, Fossil Cycad National Monument: Abolishes the monument after allowing for a period of scientific investigation.

66. S. 1992, Pioneer National Monument, Ky.: Provides for conveyance of a tract of land in Madison County, Ky., to the Pioneer National Monument Association.

67. H. R. 7927, Federal housing projects: Extends to 1 year the time in which Louisiana may make down payments for housing projects.

68. H. R. 6772, Oregon land: Conveys certain Federal land to School District No. 24 of Lake County, Ore.

69. House Joint Resolution 112, South Carolina land: Releases United States reversionary interest in certain improvements on a 3-acre tract in Orangeburg County, S. C.

70. H. R. 6625, New Mexico land: Transfers back to the Pueblo of San Lorenzo, N. Mex., 1½ acres taken by the Government for school purposes.

71. H. R. 5889, Georgia land: Transfers back certain lands to Savannah Beach, Tybee Island, Ga.

72. H. R. 622, Michigan land: releases United States right-of-way interest in Saginaw County, Mich., land.

73. H. R. 585, California land: authorizes conveyance to Lake County, Calif., of Lower Lake Rancheria, to be used as an airport.

74. S. 2246, South Dakota land: authorizes sale of certain Bankhead-Jones lands to Wall, S. Dak.

75. H. R. 4680, California land: affirms that title to a tract vested in California in 1897.

76. S. 2267, Nevada land: conveys certain public lands to Henderson, Nev.

77. H. R. 6238, war housing projects: permits transfer of war housing projects to Moses Lake, Wash., and other communities similarly situated.

78. S. 2909, Commerce seals: authorizes maintenance of seals of office by branches of the Commerce Department.

79. H. R. 5556, penalty envelopes: repeals requirement that department heads report to Postmaster General the number of penalty envelopes and wrappers on hand at year's end.

80. H. R. 5876, Copyright Office: permits deposit of photographic reproductions in the office in lieu of certain published works.

HEALTH

81. S. 2990, polio vaccine: extends to June 30, 1957, authority to make grants to the States, for their free provision of Salk vaccine to children and expectant mothers.

82. Senate Joint Resolution 115, designates February in each year as American Heart Month.

83. S. 3076, authorizes the Public Health Service to make a continuing survey of sickness and disability.

84. S. 3246, increases by \$3 million, or from \$2 million to \$5 million, the amount authorized for erection and equipment of buildings and facilities for National Institute of Dental Research.

INTERNAL SECURITY

85. S. 2887, security of juries: makes a criminal offense the tapping, recording, or unauthorized observance of grand and petit jury deliberations.

86. H. R. 3233, fleeing arson prosecution: Makes it a Federal offense to move across State lines to avoid prosecution or custody for arson.

NATURAL RESOURCES, INCLUDING FLOOD CONTROL

87. House Joint Resolution 471, home-disaster relief: Permits the FHA to provide title 1 repair assistance to new homes damaged by major disasters.

88. H. R. 7871, disaster loans: Increases to \$375 million the funds available to the Small Business Administration for disaster loans.

89. H. R. 6645, natural-gas bill: Freed independent natural-gas producers from direct Federal (FPC) price control. Vetoes February 17, 1956.

90. H. R. 7930, Russian River project: Authorizes completion of the initial stage of development at Russian River Basin, Calif., a flood-control and irrigation project.

91. S. 500, Colorado River storage: Authorizes construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River storage project.

92. Senate Joint Resolution 135, authorizes payment of \$5 million to Crow Indian Tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowstone Dam and Reservoir project, Montana and Wyoming.

93. H. R. 6309, authorizes construction of the Mississippi River-gulf outlet.

94. H. R. 6268, facilitates the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation and similar projects by making irrigation funds available for such works and items.

95. H. R. 7097, provides for reconveyance of oil and gas and mineral interests in a portion of the lands acquired for the Demopolis lock and dam project to the former owners.

96. H. R. 5556, authorizes a preliminary examination and survey of McGirts Creek, Fla., for flood control.

97. S. 180, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washita River Basin reclamation project, Oklahoma. Public Law 419, approved February 25, 1956.

98. S. 926, authorizes the Secretary of Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Ventura River reclamation project, Calif. Public Law 423, approved March 1, 1956.

SOCIAL WELFARE

99. H. R. 7036, limitation on retirement income: Increases from \$900 to \$1,200 the amount a person under 72 can earn, before his over-65 retirement credit must be reduced.

100. S. 2438, pensions: Amends the act of 1929 which provided a pension of \$125 monthly to Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever by increasing such pensions to \$200 per month.

101. S. 51, repeals the provisions of law under which States were empowered to exercise civil and criminal jurisdiction over Indian reservations without the consent of or consultation with the Indian tribes involved.

102. S. 1528, authorizes enrolled members of Three Affiliated Tribes of Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., to acquire trust interests in tribal lands.

103. S. 1555, authorizes restoration to tribal ownership certain lands in the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.

104. S. 2042, restores jurisdiction of the district courts over certain wage claims which were pending in the district courts or in the courts of appeal on October 31, 1951, and which were dismissed solely because the code was amended to remove that jurisdiction.

105. S. 2151, provides for segregating certain funds of Fort Berthold Indians on a basis of membership roll.

106. S. 3259, increases from \$250,000 to \$400,000 the appropriation to the American Printing House for the Blind and authorizes wider distribution of books and other specialized instructional material to promote the education of the blind.

107. H. R. 4802, authorizes the execution of mortgages and deeds of trust on individual Indian trust or restricted land.

108. House Concurrent Resolution 94, favors waiving State residence requirements in certain elections.

109. House Concurrent Resolution 199, extends congressional felicitations to those participating in the 250th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin.

110. House Joint Resolution 194, designates the General Grant tree in King's Canyon National Park, Calif., as a national shrine.

111. House Joint Resolution 443, authorizes additional funds for the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission.

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS

112. S. 2861, emergency highway funds: Authorizes an increase from \$10 to \$30 million in emergency relief highway funds for fiscal year 1956, as a result of flood and hurricane damage.

113. H. R. 2552, Great Lakes Channels: authorizes the modification of existing connecting channels above Lake Erie, to provide deeper channels on several tributaries.

114. H. R. 5614, FCC complaints: Allows the FCC to demur to protests against the authorization of grants, and to dismiss insubstantial protests, after oral argument, without hearings.

115. S. 1456, FCC procedure: Permits the FCC to dispense with certain duplicatory procedures relating to reports and hearings, where communications carriers are jointly owned or where consolidations are desired.

116. S. 1777, Disabled—Reduced rates: Permits common carriers to transport, for one fare, a disabled person and his attendant, if an attendant is required for such person.

117. S. 898, trip leasing: Defines the legal standards for truck trip leasing by farmers, farm cooperatives and private carriers.

118. S. 1702, clarifies the provisions of law relating to the sale or pledge of stamps by postmasters or postal employees.

119. S. 1871, provides for reimbursement to the Post Office Department for the transmission of official Government-mail matter.

120. S. 2210 modifies the project for St. Mary's River, Mich., south canal, in order to repeal the authorization for the alteration of the international bridge as a part of the project.

121. S. 2286 authorizes the utilization of privately owned American shipping services for the transportation of privately owned motor vehicles of military personnel.

122. S. 2972 punishes the willful damaging or destroying of aircraft, and attempts to willfully damage or destroy.

123. S. 3269 permits Canadian vessels to continue to serve Alaskan ports until June 30, 1957.

124. S. 3422 authorizes transfer of certain amounts from unclaimed payments on United States savings bonds to the fund created for the payment of Government losses in shipment.

125. H. R. 6043 makes permanent the Merchant Marine Academy.

126. S. 2711 authorizes medals and decorations for outstanding service in merchant marine.

127. S. 3452 increases authorization for aircraft control and warning system.

THE PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in the course of the recent farm debate, I referred to a poll which the Watertown Daily Times, one of the finest newspapers in upstate New York, has been conducting among the farmers of northern New York on the price-support program.

It is an amazing fact, according to the Watertown Times of Saturday, March 31, that over 90 percent of those

who have thus far participated in the poll voted in opposition to the Benson flexible price-support program. Only 8.76 percent voted in favor. Over 50 percent indicated their support for 90 percent price supports.

Mr. President, I believe the Watertown Daily Times is performing a great public service in conducting this poll. I expect to report to Congress the periodic results of this poll as they are printed in the Watertown Times. At this point, I should like to congratulate the Watertown Times on this undertaking.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the interim report of March 31 on the dairy farmers poll, as published in Farm and Garden, the farm supplement of the Watertown Daily Times, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPINIONS EMPHATIC IN FARM POLL—FLEXIBLE SUPPORTS DISLIKED—\$6 MILK IS STRONGLY FAVORED

(By Boyd W. Moffett)

A 3½ weeks' dairy-farmers' poll, conducted by Farm and Garden to sample northern New York dairy-farmer opinion with respect to issues involved in any Federal farm program, has been concluded.

In tabulating the final results, these highlights stand out:

1. A total of 335 persons responded. There were 331 who sent in ballots and 4 who replied in letter form but did not enclose a ballot.

2. Of the 331 who filed ballots, 302, or 91.24 percent, voted against the Benson flexible price-support plan. A total of 29, or 8.76 percent, marked "Yes" on that No. 1 question on the ballot.

3. To the question: "Are you in favor of subsidies paid to farmers?" there were 254, or 76.74 percent, who answered "Yes." Sixty-eight, or 20.54 percent, said "No." This inquiry was unanswered on 9 ballots, or 2.72 percent.

4. On the parity question, 90 percent price support was the overwhelming favorite. A total of 168, or 50.76 percent, cast their ballots for that figure.

5. Six-dollar milk was the big choice. A total of 154, or 46.53 percent, listed this figure as the price they believed would be fair to them.

6. Although the ballot did not request identification, 82 of the 335 who responded either signed their names and addresses, or dispatched the information in personalized envelopes.

7. There were 37 letters received—33 of them with ballots attached. Twenty-six of the letters bore signatures. And on 112 of the ballots, senders wrote comment in the margins.

8. A total of 73 different northern New York communities were represented in the voting. The area covered extended from Sandy Creek and Lacona, on the south, to Ausable Forks, on the north, and Boonville, on the east.

Farmer opinion on the price-support and subsidy questions was emphatically distinct. With reference to parity, however, the answers were more varied.

While 90 percent was the favorite, with 169 votes, 100 percent ranked second, attracting 89 votes, or 26.89 percent of the 331 total. Eleven farmers, or 3.32 percent, voted for 85 percent of parity, while 10, or 3.02 percent, marked in 95 percent.

There were other scattered figures as follows: Eight in favor of 150 percent, 5 for 75 percent, 2 for 125 percent, and 1 vote each

for 200, 110, 104, 98, 82, 60, and 50 percent. Thirty-three failed to answer this question.

Similarly, there were 19 different suggested milk prices. Six dollars per hundredweight led the poll, followed by \$5, favored by 78 farmers, or 22.98 percent. A price of \$5.50 was chosen by 50 voters, or 15.11 percent. In third position was a figure of \$4.50, listed on 15 ballots, or 4.53 percent.

Other scattered price quotations included: \$6.50 and \$4, by 4 farmers each; \$6.94, \$4.40, and \$4.25, by 3 each; \$7, \$5.75, and \$4.75, by 2 each; and \$10, \$7.50, \$6.35, \$6.25, \$4.95, \$4.85, and \$4.70, each with 1 vote. There were only six ballot-senders who did not insert a price choice.

The Dairy Farmers' Poll brought forth many interesting sidelights.

As one Adams section farmer wrote: "I think this is the first time the family-size farmers have had a chance to let people know what they think."

Another, this man a resident of Mannsville, wrote: "What pleases me is when farmers have the right to vote individually, the truth comes out."

The one farmer who asked for \$10 per hundred for his milk and 150 percent price support, choice, noted that he preferred subsidies "rather than work for nothing."

Another, who listed \$6 milk and 150 percent price support, wrote that "I would like farmers to get \$2 per hour."

And still another concluded making out his ballot with this written-in note: "I wonder if what we think ever means anything."

The No. 1 question on the ballot, concerning the Benson flexible price-support plan, seemed to draw the strongest comment. Here are some of the typical notations scribbled along the margins of the ballots:

"I am not in favor of Benson."

"I have no use for Benson. He will wreck the Republican Party."

"We have all of Ike and Benson we want."

"I am a Republican but will vote Democratic. This administration is no good for the farmers."

"We want Democratic times. Most farmers will be on welfare before long, or bankrupt."

"If the GOP loses the eastern farmers' vote they can thank Benson for it."

Then, of course, there were a few who were even more rash in their attack on the Secretary of Agriculture—and even the President. Among those sharp notes were:

"I have no use for Benson."

"Remove Benson."

"Please help kick Benson out."

"I think we have the worst President and Secretary of Agriculture we ever had or ever will. They are out to starve the farmers and help the big shots."

Of the 29 farmers who marked their ballots in favor of the Benson flexible-price support plan, a few sent along brief letters or notes. Among the comments were these:

"Benson's flexible plan is the best for the farmer in the long run, but in the meantime milk is still going down."

"While Secretary Benson has made his mistakes, to me he is sincerely trying to straighten out the milk problem. If we stick with Benson it will straighten itself out. It takes more than a couple years to straighten out a mess that has existed for so long."

"Some people wouldn't have enough if they got \$10 a hundred."

The comment on subsidies was not quite as strong, but here again the ballot senders made their voices heard. Many of those who voted in favor of subsidies said:

"If we cannot have a fair price without them," or "as long as other businesses get them."

Several commented that they did not believe in subsidies "for any farm produce," and a number of farmers dislike subsidies of any type.

Comment on the parity question was fairly light. One farmer wrote in: "What is parity? Dealers set the price then."

Another wrote he favored keeping grains and milk at the same support level. And there were many who observed that "if we're going to have supports, the figure should be 100 percent, if any."

Varied comment also was noticed on the milk price inquiry. Scores of the ballots carried the notation that the year-around price should be \$5. Some favored \$4.50. "If we could get \$4.50 the year around for the blend price, we might keep out of the red," wrote 1 farmer.

Still others leaned toward a price of \$6 in winter and either \$5 or \$4 in summer. One man suggested \$6 for 3.5 milk for 5 months and \$5 for the other 7 months.

Then there were these two notations: "Five dollar milk with labor at \$1 an hour."

"Seven dollars per hundredweight would allow me \$1 per hour wages, plus 2 percent interest on investment."

Here are a few of the other general comments which were made on the ballots:

Subsidies should be paid "directly, not to distributors or dealers."

"A thousand times 'no,' (with respect to the flexible price support plan)."

"Keep the Government out of agriculture."

"Subsidy money comes from the taxpayer—you and me—not the Government."

"A fair price for his work and investment would be appreciated."

And, to cap the climax, was this one: "Please do something about the poor farmer. Stop to think; that is where all your milk comes from."

The dairy farmers' poll ballot appeared in Farm and Garden on three successive Saturdays—March 3, March 10, and March 17. Previous reports on the progress of the balloting were issued March 10, 17, and 24. All ballots received up to this past Wednesday were included in this final tabulation.

PROBLEMS FACING MAINE FISHERIES

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, recently I received from the Portland Fisheries Association of Portland, Maine, a letter which is an excellent summary of the problems facing Maine fisheries. While the letter pertains especially to local conditions in Portland, the suggestions it contains have application to the problems shared by the fisheries of all sections of our country. These problems merit very careful consideration by the Federal Government, and it is my hope that every Member of Congress will give this letter some careful thought, with particular reference to the corrective measures which have been suggested by the Portland Fisheries Association.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that the text of this letter from the Portland Fisheries Association may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, MAINE, March 30, 1956.
Senator FREDERICK G. PAYNE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PAYNE: The undersigned, who are the charter members of an association now in the process of being formed, called Portland Fisheries Association, which association is being organized for the purpose of promoting, protecting, developing and assisting the Maine Fishing Industry,

have drafted this letter to point out to you, our Senator, some of the many problems which the fishing industry, including boat owners, fish plant owners, fishermen, and those connected with the fishing industry in Maine, are facing.

First, we would like to present some facts and figures:

In 1946, the average price of fish per pound, ex vessel, in Maine was as follows:

| | |
|---------------|-------|
| Haddock | 0.081 |
| Hake | .043 |
| Pollock | .037 |
| Redfish | .039 |
| Round whiting | .016 |
| Black backs | .047 |

In 1956, 10 years later, the price of these same classes of fish is almost exactly the same, with the exception of whiting, which has dropped to between 0.010 and 0.0125 per pound.

Nor has this lack of increase in price been helped much by increase in volume, since the following comparison between the number of pounds of fish landed in Maine in 1946 and those landed in 1955 shows that only the landings of haddock, redfish, and whiting have increased, while the landing of black backs, pollock, and hake have substantially decreased:

Landings, 1946

| | |
|---------------|------------|
| Haddock | 2,814,800 |
| Hake | 8,418,400 |
| Pollock | 7,098,100 |
| Redfish | 41,072,400 |
| Round whiting | 5,696,600 |
| Black backs | 1,080,100 |

Landings, 1955

| | |
|---------------|------------|
| Haddock | 4,009,249 |
| Hake | 2,398,185 |
| Pollock | 5,051,212 |
| Redfish | 67,684,954 |
| Round whiting | 25,092,249 |
| Black backs | 918,000 |

In spite of the fact that the price per pound of fish is no higher in 1956 than it was in 1946, the cost of operating fishing vessels has more than doubled. P. & I. insurance has increased in cost over the past 4 or 5 years alone from approximately \$125 per man per year to approximately \$300 per man per year. Hull insurance has increased from approximately 4½ percent to 9 or 10 percent (based on the age of the vessel) and, in addition, prior to 1951 or 1952 the rate included 100-percent valuation with no deductible and full Inchmarce clause. The 1956 rate is based on a \$250 deductible, an 80-percent valuation, and a limited Inchmarce clause which no longer covers machinery damage due to negligence of master, mates, pilots, engineers, etc. It is also becoming extremely difficult, if not impossible, to place hull insurance on vessels over 10 years old, and as you may know, most of the Portland fleet are over 10 years old.

Other items which are indispensable to the operation of fishing vessels, and therefore to the whole fishing industry, are repairs, fuel oil, wire rope, and manila line. In 1946 the average wage in shipyards in the Portland area for unskilled labor was \$1.50 to \$1.75 per hour. Today the average wage is \$3 to \$3.50 per hour. In 1946 fuel oil was 11 cents per gallon; today it is 14½ cents per gallon. In 1946 wire rope was \$17.20 per hundred feet; today it is \$27 per hundred feet. In 1946 manila line was 45 cents per pound; today it is 52 cents per pound.

Adding fuel to the flame is the fact that in 1946, the bulk of the fishing out of Portland was done between 60 and 150 miles from Portland, while today the bulk of the fishing is done on the Grand Banks, which are from 800 to 1,000 miles away. You can easily see what this added distance does to the profits of everyone connected with the fishing industry. It means that the boat-owners have 10 times the maintenance and

repair expenses that they used to have. The fishermen who have to pay for fuel, ice, and food under our present share system have to pay several times more for these items than they did a few years ago. The fish company's supply becomes erratic, as it is difficult to predict time of landings. This added distance also has an adverse effect on younger men who might want to come into the fishing industry because, whereas in 1946 trips averaged 7 days for a vessel of 150,000-250,000 pounds capacity, today these same vessels are out sometimes 17 days.

To demonstrate the very sad condition of the fishing industry in Portland at the present time, as compared to a few years ago, we present the following facts:

In 1946, 34 vessels were fishing out of Portland; today there are only 19. Of these 19, 2 are 5 years old or newer, 2 are between 5 and 10 years old, 2 are between 10 and 15 years old, 1 is between 15 and 20 years old, and the remaining 12, or the majority of the fleet, are over 20 years old.

Another fact which even better demonstrates conditions in Portland is that in the last 2 years 5 fish companies have been forced to close their doors and go out of business, leaving only 13 active companies at the present time.

In short, the undersigned feel that the following factors are largely responsible for the present unhealthy condition of the Portland fishing industry:

1. The consistently low ex-vessel price of fish, coupled with the long haul to the fishing grounds and the greatly increased cost of operation, make it almost impossible to operate fishing vessels at a profit.

2. The refusal of local banks to extend credit to fish plants and to loan money to fishing-vessel owners secured by first preferred mortgages on the vessels has prevented the modernization of fish plants and deprived vessel owners of enough working capital to properly maintain and repair their vessels. It has also almost completely prevented the construction of new vessels for the fleet. For Portland, only 3 new vessels have been built for the fleet that were over 70 gross tons in size, in the last 10 years. At the present time no new vessels are under construction or even in prospect for Portland.

3. The failure of present conservation methods to prevent the source of supply from moving further and further away from Portland.

4. The importing, without restriction, of fresh fish from foreign countries which, because of a lower standard of living, are underselling Portland fish, which is already priced far too low for the members of the fishing industry to make a decent living.

The undersigned respectfully submit for your consideration the following suggestions that they feel will definitely benefit the Portland fishing industry, the Maine fishing industry, and in fact the whole east coast fishing industry:

1. Have the so-called Jones Act amended so that it does not include crewmen on fishing vessels (which it was never designed for anyway). We feel that fishermen should all be treated equally and that they should be protected and cared for when ill or injured by a compensation act similar to the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

2. Establish a governmental lending institution somewhat similar to the RFC which would make loans to fishing vessel owners and to fish plant owners. These loans would be serviced and processed through local banks and would be properly screened. These loans would be available not only for modernization and improvement of fish plants, for maintaining, repairing and improving fishing vessels as well as for the construction of new vessels, but would also be

available in time of emergency caused by hurricanes, and so forth.

3. Establish a subsidy plan for fishing vessels, similar to the subsidy available to merchant vessels. After all, fishing vessels are essential to our national defense, both as a source of food and as coastal patrol vessels.

4. To have the Government contribute to the high cost of P. & I. and hull insurance, in the event of the Jones Act is not amended to exclude fishing vessels.

5. Have a fisheries commission established in Washington, with branches in the various States in which there are fishing industries. This commission would operate similar to the Agriculture Commission and would be well staffed with trained personnel who could educate the members of the fishing industry and the public in general, if interested, in the most efficiently scientific methods of fishing, processing, and selling, and would also make continuous research into better methods of conservation.

6. Set up a flexible parity system similar to the farm program which would enable the vessel owner and the fisherman to get reasonable returns on their investments, whether it be of money or of time.

7. Curtail the importing of fresh fish from foreign countries to the extent necessary to allow the American fishing industry to survive. This does not apply to frozen fish.

Portland Fisheries Association, by its Charter Members; Bernard F. Harris, A. J. Pedersen, G. I. Lewis, Otis L. Thompson, Mortier D. Harris, Harold Paulson, John E. Willard, Jr. (by H. Paulson).

Attested:

BENJAMIN THOMPSON,
Secretary.

FLOOD INSURANCE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the Senate for about 4 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New York is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, for the past 4 weeks I have had my staff reporting to me almost daily on the weather bulletins from upper New York State. These past weeks have been times of momentous world and national developments. Yet there has not been a day during this period when I have not been very deeply concerned to know whether or not it was raining in upper New York State.

Does that sound like a petty matter, Mr. President? I assure you it is not. During these weeks the threat of flood has hovered over New Yorkers like the fabled sword of Damocles—suspended over their heads by a thin hair of chance and the weather. In the early part of this period New York State experienced a succession of heavy blizzards. As a result the disaster operations office of the Federal Civil Defense Administration informed me that there was a potential 12 inches of water on every square foot of the upper Mohawk valley. In the adjacent State of Pennsylvania, Warren County was declared a major disaster area by President Eisenhower. In the rest of New England, there was a heavy snow blanket of varying degrees of thickness. At any moment during this time, a heavy rainfall, a sudden thaw, even a thundersquall could release these tons and tons of water to pour down the valleys and repeat the tragic destruction of the floods of last summer and autumn.

As it happens, Mr. President, we have been lucky. There has been no really heavy rain. There has been no sudden thaw. Rather the warm weather has arrived gradually, and the floods experienced have been only minor. They are what the disaster operations office refers to as local and basement flooding. But even basement flooding can spell tragedy for the person to whom it happens. Let me read a brief fragment from a letter I received from the victim of an earlier so-called minor local flood:

We borrowed quite a bit of money last fall to put in a new furnace and to make repairs as a result of the flood in March 1955. That money and those repairs are lost, we can't borrow again, we haven't paid off last fall's loan.

We have no heat as yet, our hot water tank is broken, our washing machine is ruined, the basement floor is damaged and everything stored in the basement is lost. These may seem like small matters to some people but to small people like us trying to raise a family it's close to a disaster.

We can't sell this house; we have tried through the real estate dealers. The only thing left is to let the house revert to the bank and lose our GI rights.

That, Mr. President, is what basement flooding can mean.

Can anything be done about such situations? Indeed there can. Flood control projects are a part of the answer. I will have much to say about this at a later date, for the fact is that New York, and her sister States in the Northeast have been consistently shortchanged on flood control appropriations. It has been carefully calculated that my own State has received on the average about one-fifteenth of what she might reasonably expect on the basis of her needs and the peril to which she is exposed. At the same time, New York has cheerfully and willingly supported flood control projects and other Federal benefits all over the Nation. When I say supported, Mr. President, I do not mean merely that New York's Representatives in Congress have voted for these projects. I mean that New York State has paid for them. For New York State furnishes a larger single portion of the total revenues collected by the National Government than does any other State.

But, as I say, Mr. President, flood control is only a part of the answer, for human ingenuity can never anticipate all the combinations of events that may cause a flood. Floods can and do occur where no flood ever occurred before. The other part of the answer therefore is insurance, flood insurance. Perhaps no flood-control structure could prevent the flooding of an occasional basement and the kind of loss the letter I have read describes. Flood control therefore must be buttressed with flood insurance.

The Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate has been working on a proposal for such insurance since early last fall. The problems are many, for this kind of insurance has not been tried heretofore. But we are making good progress. We have held many informative and helpful hearings during the fall and winter. During the past 2 weeks, staff meetings have been resolving the differences between the administration flood insurance bill and the Lehman-

Kennedy bill which is cosponsored by many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle. It is my hope that the Committee on Banking and Currency will be able to report a clean bill to the Senate by the latter part of this month. I have high hopes for this bill, and I trust the Senate will agree that the many months spent in developing its provisions will prove to have been months well spent.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ATTEMPT BY CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION TO INFLUENCE THE VOTE OF A SENATOR

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Select Committee composed of four Senators, and appointed by the Senate to investigate the matter called to the attention of the Senate by the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has finished its work.

I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the record and all files now in the possession of the committee or its counsel be turned over to the Special Committee on Lobbying.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, before the Senator from Georgia leaves the Chamber, may I, speaking as the acting minority leader, inquire if my understanding is correct, from what the Senator has just said, that all the files will be turned over to the special committee but that the select committee has made or will make a formal report to the Senate, which will be printed and be available?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the information of the Senator from Massachusetts, the report has already been submitted.

Mr. GEORGE. The report has already been filed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

FEDERAL INDIAN POLICY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before the Easter recess I received a reply to my most recent communication to the Secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay, relative to Federal Indian Policy and the situation among the Indians on Hill 57 in Great Falls, Mont. In brief, there is nothing new in the letter. The Department continues to refuse to inject any flexibility in its rigid policy toward the American Indian.

I wish to make several brief observations about this letter. The Secretary says that 87.5 percent of all Indian children attended public, Federal, or mission schools in 1955. The national figures for all children—6 to 18, inclusive—in the United States is 97.1 percent. The record of education for Indian children is good, but it can be improved.

In the Secretary's letter to me, dated February 8, 1956, with respect to the relocation program, he stated:

There has not been a single complaint on this score from the communities.

However in this most recent communication he has qualified his statement with respect to the relocation program,

he states now that there is "generally satisfactory adjustment of the individual Indians." Perhaps this qualification is due to recent stories in national periodicals giving another picture of the relocation program.

In my letter to Mr. McKay on February 18, I questioned the discrepancy between his firm stand against aid to Indians who do not live on a reservation and a statement made by Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Wesley A. D'Ewart that the Department would help those Indians who are in need of relief assistance and cannot obtain it from other sources. Secretary McKay regrets the lack of clarity in this matter and has reaffirmed his stand of confining Federal aid to Indians to those residing on Indian reservations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of the Secretary of Interior dated March 20, 1956, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington D. C., March 20, 1956.
Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: Reference is made to your letter of February 18, 1956, in which you offered further comment upon the situation among the Indians on Hill 57 in Great Falls, Mont., as well as upon statements of Bureau policy.

Regarding your question raised in connection with Federal-State cooperation in the education of Indian children, the 49.2 figure is the percent of all Indian children of school age (6-18 inclusive) who were attending public schools in the fiscal year 1955 but does not include the enrollment of Indian children in Federal or mission schools. Comparable figures for Indian children to the National Education Association estimate of 97.1 percent of all children of school age in attendance for the same period is as follows:

| | |
|--|------|
| Percent Indian children in school..... | 87.5 |
| In public schools..... | 49.2 |
| In Federal schools..... | 30.2 |
| In mission schools..... | 8.1 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Percent Indian children not in school..... | 7.7 |
| Percent for which information not received..... | 4.8 |

It is the desire of the Bureau to extend the services of the relocation program to all agencies and jurisdictions where the Indian people are in need of this service. Our experience in developing the relocation program has indicated that the care taken in giving counseling and guidance to Indian relocatees, both before their departure from reservations and after arrival in metropolitan areas served by our field relocation offices, is reflected in the generally satisfactory adjustment of the individual Indians. Because of the limited appropriations in the past years for this program, we have necessarily been required to limit the availability of services to those reservations with the greatest need, and to a limited number of metropolitan areas.

We have felt for some time that considerable expansion of relocation activity should take place to provide services to the increasing number who are interested in relocation. Our proposals for this activity for the fiscal year 1957, if approved by Congress, will make available relocation services at

additional reservations and metropolitan areas.

As to the statement on welfare policies quoted from the letter to Mr. T. A. Busey, publisher, the *Glacier Reporter*, Browning, Mont., the general assistance program of the Bureau of Indian Affairs for needy Indians, ineligible for public assistance and not receiving general assistance from their county departments of public welfare, is confined to those residing on Indian reservations. We regret that it was not made entirely clear in the letter to Mr. Busey that the statements applied only to those Indians under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. As we wrote you on February 8, 1956, we believe our proper role is to care for those Indians on reservations who are not cared for by other agencies and to continue our role of working with communities when we can be of assistance in an advisory or cooperative way for those Indians who have moved away from Indian reservations.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS MCKAY,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Uprooting the Indians," written by Ruth Mulvey Harmer, and published in the March issue of the *Atlantic* be made a part of the *RECORD* at the conclusion of my remarks. This article by Mrs. Harmer is a very revealing and thought-provoking study of the Department of Interior's Indian relocation program.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD* at the conclusion of Mr. MANSFIELD's remarks.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article entitled "The Raid on the Reservations," written by Dorothy Van de Mark, and published in the March issue of *Harper's* magazine.

EXHIBIT A

UPROOTING THE INDIANS

(By Ruth Mulvey Harmer)

I

Two months ago Little Light, her husband Leonard Bear, and their five children were persons of standing in a Creek Indian community in Oklahoma. They had only 80 acres of poor land and a modest cabin, but except for the hungry seasons they understood their way of life; they were at peace.

Today they are slum dwellers in Los Angeles, without land or home or culture or peace. Leonard Bear and his family have become part of that vast army of displaced persons which has been created by the Government's policy of accelerating the integration of the Indian. Uprooted from their native soil, many without even the weapon of comprehensible language with which to defend themselves, the 400,000 indigenous Americans still living in reservations and small communities are being turned loose upon the asphalt jungles of metropolitan centers in one of the most extraordinary forced migrations in history.

The relocation program being carried out by the Bureau of Indian Affairs was established in 1951 to help the Indians become part of the national economy and part of the national life. However, it did not really become important until August 15, 1953, when President Eisenhower signed Public Law 280. That law, which he branded as most un-Christian, authorizes any State to substitute its own law for Federal Indian law and its own codes for Indian tribal codes. It was enthusiastically hailed in the Western States

by persons who had long been seeking legal sanction to move in on Indian lands, superficially poor but rich in subsurface oil and minerals. Further strength was given to the program to dislodge the Indians under the terms of the Watkins bill (Senate 2670), providing that the 177 pure-blood Paiutes who own 45,000 acres of potentially valuable land in Nevada should no longer receive Federal aid protection. Another precedent to weaken the Indians' hold on their whittled-down grants was set by Senate bill 2745, which forcibly removed from trusteeship all individually owned Klamath lands in Oregon and which authorized any enrolled Klamath to force the tribe to sell its corporate holdings in order to buy him out.

Other bills now pending promise to end all Federal services to Indians, to liquidate all tribal organizations, and to dispose of their holdings.

However, the Bureau of Indian Affairs is accomplishing that end so rapidly through the relocation program that additional laws may be simply ex post facto legislative items. A remarkably effective sales campaign is prompting thousands of Indians to abandon their lands and interests for the promised lands of the relocation centers.

In defense of the program, an officer of the Bureau of Indian Affairs points out that some of the new immigrants to the urban centers have become model citizens and are enjoying the fruits of 20th century civilization * * * up to and including television sets. That is true. But the Bureau is curiously vague about the number of maladjustments and even the number of returnees, which well-informed welfare and social workers in several of the centers set at 60 percent.

For every success story, there are a 100 failures. For every former trapper-farmer now adjusted to assembly-line work and city life, there are 99 adrift in a new and hostile environment. Against the optimistic pronouncement of Government agents that with a little proper guidance, Indians have no trouble making the major adjustment from reservation to city life is the bitter cry of Little Light: "So this is the land of sunshine they promised us."

A damning summary of the program was spoken by a woman in the chairless kitchen-dining-living room of a small shanty on the outskirts of Los Angeles. Five children, black eyes round with wonder in their apricot faces, sheltered against her skirt. The walls were unpainted, the floor a patchwork of linoleum. Through an archway, another room was visible where three beds crowded together. A two-burner gas stove stood on a box, and on the only other piece of furniture in the room—a battered table—rested the remains of dinner: some white, grease-soaked bags which had contained hamburgers and fried potatoes prepared by the restaurant a few blocks away.

She answered our questions in an Indian dialect which the woman beside me interpreted. "No, my husband is not here. He went out with some other men. He does every night. They are drinking."

"Yes, he is working. He makes lots of money. One dollar and sixty cents an hour in the airplane factory."

"Yes, the children are in school. All but Zena." She indicated one of the girls, about 10 years old. "Zena is sick. I don't know what sickness. There is no doctor."

"Yes, the food came from that place. I don't go to the store often. Everybody laughs at me."

"Yes, I want to go back. There is not money. We pay \$75 a month for this house. We pay for food. We pay for lights. We don't have the money to go back."

Then the patient planes of her face became distorted. "They did not tell us it would be like this."

What had "they" told Little Light and her husband?

A good indication may be found in an article entitled "Relocation News" written by George Shubert for the Fort Berthold Agency and *News Bulletin* of Newtown, N. Dak., for May 12, 1955. Following a glowing account of jobs for young men and women with a large company in Chicago—"skilled, lifetime jobs * * * with paid vacation, sick benefits, paid pension plan, union membership, protection, etc."—the Indian Affairs officer wrote:

"This office is presently equipped to offer financial assistance to a large number of qualified persons who have an earnest desire to improve their standard of living, by accepting permanent employment and relocation to 1 of 4 large urban areas in the United States; namely Chicago, Ill., Denver, Colo., Oakland, Calif. (including the entire bay area) and Los Angeles, Calif."

"Our offices in those areas are presently able to place on jobs and render any assistance necessary to practically an unlimited number of families. They also state that there is a good selection of employment opportunities and housing facilities available at the present time."

"The rapidly rising waters in the bottom lands of the reservation should remind us of the fact that the Fort Berthold people have lost forever over one-half of the natural resources and practically all of their class 1 and 2 agricultural lands, comprising one-quarter of the area of the entire reservation and one-half of the agricultural resources, thereby rendering the remaining portions of the reservation inadequate to provide subsistence for the remaining members of the tribes, at a standard comparable to the people adjacent to the reservation."

"We feel that a workable solution to the above problem would be to avail yourselves of the opportunities offered by the Relocation Branch of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. It must be at least worthy of serious consideration for persons who have ambitions to advance economically and socially and to provide better opportunity for their children."

Undeniably, the pitch is effective. The prospect is given a choice between the nothing of life in Fort Berthold and the glittering something of security and prosperity elsewhere; aid and friendship will be given to those who make the "right" choice. And even if the prospect is reluctant to send in the boxtop for himself, he should think of his children.

For those who cannot be reached by words, there is the poster recently concocted in the Los Angeles Relocation Center picturing a number of pleasant, comfortable houses owned by Indians who are shown demonstrating the wonders of garbage disposals in the assorted kitchens and of television sets in the assorted living rooms.

The salesmanship rates an A plus, but what about the product?

II

First of all, the Government's financial assistance in connection with relocation is limited specifically to one-way travel costs and a weekly allowance until the first pay check comes in. Those monetary aids are made only to persons without any funds; partial grants are given to those who have some reserves. But that even the maximum grant is sufficient is highly debatable: transportation costs and a living allowance for a few weeks might be all that a bright young man moving from San Francisco to New York would need to tide him over the transitional period; it is not enough to cover the period of adjustment needed by a family moving from a pre-Columbian culture into the mechanized 20th century.

"Accepting permanent employment" is another rather meaningless phrase since absolute job security is almost nonexistent.

Moreover, many of the Indians find it impossible to work in foundries or at assembly-line jobs after a history of outdoor experience. The Bureau of Indian Affairs accepts no responsibility for those who wish to transfer from the jobs they took blind when they first arrived.

That the Relocation Offices in the 4 areas are presently able to "render any assistance necessary to practically an unlimited number of families" is an absurdity. In Los Angeles, where between 150 and 200 new arrivals are pouring in each month under Government sponsorship (another 100 are coming on their own), the Relocation Office has a staff of 14 persons, including clerks, receptionist, secretaries, and others who play no active role in the integration. Those who do, necessarily confine themselves to receiving the Indians who show up at the office, making job contracts for them, giving them a living allowance and the address of a vacant dwelling.

This sketchy reception is obviously a prologue to disaster for persons whose acquaintance with the American language is painfully new if it exists at all, who are not accustomed to handling money—most of them have lived in an agricultural environment where barter is the approved method of exchange—who are generally more ignorant of urban ways than a 6-year-old child reared in a city, and who become unutterably lonely removed from the security of tribal identity.

Their first glimpse of city life is rarely happy. In Los Angeles, where there has been an acute housing shortage since the beginning of World War II, the Indians have been hard pressed to find decent accommodations. Many of them are sent to antiquated rooming houses and apartments in the Bunker Hill area, which is now being razed with Federal and municipal funds. Others are sent to trailer courts and dreary buildings in the southern part of the city near the aircraft plants.

For many, a few days is enough; others leave in a few weeks; some stay, and for most the going is rough. A number of the men—particularly the GI's and those who have taken the 5-year training course at Sherman Institute or other Government schools—fare rather well. They know English, they have learned a trade, they have had an extended relationship with white men and white men's ways. But most are hopeless and dangerous misfits.

The Indians in Los Angeles—and there are now 10,000 of them, representing 86 tribes—have had a relatively good police record: a 1 percent arrest, mostly on charges of drunken driving and plain drunk. That figure soared in 1955. During the Memorial Day lost week-end, an estimated 1 out of every 4 of the men haled into court was an Indian. Not long ago, for the first time in the history of Los Angeles an Indian was picked up by the police for child beating—a crime unheard of among them. Recently, and for the first time, a number have been arrested for sex offenses. Women and children have been getting into trouble, too.

III

When a 21-year-old Sioux was brought before a municipal court judge to defend himself on a charge of drunken driving, he apologized: "If I go into a bar and have a couple of drinks everyone is nice to me. Friendly. I feel good then."

At that point, a small, slim Indian woman rose to intercede. "This boy is not delinquent," she told the judge. "We are."

By "we," Stevie Whiteflower Standingbear meant the Los Angeles Indian Center which she heads and which is doing heroic work to make relocation easier for its victims. The center began in 1935 when Myra Bartlett, an Indian, and a singer on the Orpheum Circuit, decided to establish a meeting place for the Indian women working as housemaids whom she encountered each Thurs-

day afternoon gathered at the streetcar terminal for a weekly visit. It was a refugee center during the depression and was reorganized under the American Friends Service Committee in 1948 and supported by that group until last October. Now on its own, with a \$20,000 yearly budget and a staff of 2 persons—Mrs. Standingbear and Mary Buck—the center has become an island of security for the Indians in Los Angeles.

One of its main functions is to make available to newly arrived and needy Indians the help of those established in the city. More than 200 volunteers render all kinds of services from baby sitting and practical nursing to loaning or giving money, finding decent living quarters, obtaining medical treatment, and just visiting.

Aside from this emergency work, the center provides a familiar environment for the 10,000 Indians in Los Angeles. Its dances, dinners, classes, clubs, and activities for all age groups have an average weekly attendance of more than 600. The center's chapter of Alcoholics Anonymous has rescued scores of men and women. Although the center itself has little money, it is often able to scrape up a bit to tide destitute persons over a period of immediate want. This is particularly valuable since municipal and State services are not available to persons who have not fulfilled residence requirements. "We can get medical care for some people by taking them—including pregnant women—through the emergency entrance," Stevie Standingbear reports. But those who are not specifically emergency cases must either find a creditor or wait until their sickness becomes acute. A small number obtain some help from one of the professional men and women who aid the center as a charity. The courts parole to the center some of the newer arrivals who have been picked up for drunkenness. "If we can only get to them during the first few weeks they are here, we can save a lot of suffering," Mrs. Standingbear feels.

Occasionally the center makes demands on some of the municipal agencies; several months ago a committee headed by Mrs. Regina Johnson persuaded the Health Department to close and condemn a group of dwellings to which Indian arrivals were being referred by the relocation center. She had found the place while calling on a list of recent arrivals to invite them to a party at the Indian center.

"You don't need to see them. They don't need to go to no parties." The landlady had tried to block her way. "They have all the parties they want right here."

In a sense, she was right. Mrs. Johnson found the shanties where they were staying crammed with mops and floor wax thanks to the Stanley parties given by neighboring women to which the Indians had been threateningly invited and instructed to buy or else. But the parties were the least of the troubles of the 20 families unfortunate enough to land at the Government-approved address. The original building was in fair shape, but not the 20 flimsy "coops" built around it by the enterprising owner. Rent for the 2-room shacks ranged between \$60 and \$80 a month. Conveniences were minimal. The outdoor toilets were not functioning and the occupants of the 20 apartments had to depend upon the hospitality of 1 woman in the main building who had plumbing in working order and who was willing to permit them to use it. Bad cases of impetigo bred by filth afflicted most of the children, and young and old were generally suffering colds and bronchial disorders.

Why didn't they move? According to one young woman, the landlady announced that anyone who made any trouble would be handed over to the police.

"It was one of the worst things I have ever seen," Mrs. Johnson says. She and her husband (a white man), parents of a young

soldier son, have been working full time for years to help Indians adjust to Los Angeles. So have a number of other immigrants, like Myron Denetdale, who has been with North American Aviation for 10 years, and his wife Virginia; Pakali and Alex Reifel, a Sioux couple who spend their evenings and week ends visiting the jails trying to aid men and women there; Frank Peshlakal, a Navaho who has been working in a Los Angeles plant for 16 years and who now has his own business.

The dedication of the staff and the volunteers has enabled the center to perform almost incredible tasks. To a large degree, it has permitted the successful integration of hundreds of Indians, and it has minimized the problem of relocation in Los Angeles. Many cities have fared worse. In Minneapolis, Indians, who comprise less than 1 percent of the city's general population, make up more than 10 percent of the inmates at the men's workhouse and almost 70 percent at the women's workhouse. Judge Luther Sletten of that city's municipal court calls it "one of our gravest social problems."

Obviously, something must be done with Indian lands inadequate to support the present and fast-growing population. One solution would be a kind of domestic point 4 program which would enable the Indians to make the most of the rich potential of reservation lands. Instead of being hindered, they should be encouraged to start businesses on reservations and in their communities. Young men with trade and technical training have had to leave home in order to utilize their newly acquired skills. One of the recent applicants for help in finding a job at the Los Angeles Indian Center was a former GI who had attended a barbers' school after his discharge. He returned to his reservation with an enthusiastic plan to open a barbershop, but Government agents said "No." Schools and extension classes should be instituted to help the Indians exploit their resources. If necessary, tribal funds which have been impounded could pay the costs of running them.

If, however, the program to dislodge the Indians is to be an all-out one, some educational program must be established to prevent the creation of another acute minority problem. It is imperative to slow down the relocation until the Indians have been prepared for integration.

The first step would be to institute a comprehensive orientation program in the relocation centers and on the reservations, providing some education and vocational training for the Indians who are to be sent into a mechanized, urban environment.

Secondly, there should be a thorough screening process to make sure that those who are participating in the program are able to make the adjustment physically and mentally. Obviously, a knowledge of the English language is a prerequisite. So is at least fair health. Many of the new arrivals have been women in advanced pregnancy; many have been men with tuberculosis scars and other defects which make them unacceptable to industries.

Instead of being given the rosy picture of the promised land, the Indians who are leaving the security of their old life should have a more realistic picture of what lies before them. Most of them, Mrs. Standingbear says, are "woefully prepared." Few bring changes of clothing, bedding, or even cooking utensils—apparently under the delusion that the centers will "take care of everything."

Courses in household management are a must for women who have never seen electric lights and know nothing about shopping and little about cooking anything but the foods they have always eaten, which are rarely available. One woman was severely burned when her little tot tried to light the unfamiliar gas stove in their city dwelling.

A health insurance program is a must since the limited budgets of unskilled workers settling down in a new environment rarely stretch to cover medical and hospital bills. And the municipalities charged with their integration should make exceptions to residence requirements in order to permit the new arrivals to avail themselves of necessary services. The American Indians, that long-suffering and inarticulate minority, have a great contribution to make to our culture. Unless they are permitted to do that, they will become a social and economic burden of magnitude—a shadow on the national conscience.

Mr. LANGER subsequently said:

Mr. President, just before the Senator from Montana began to discuss the matter of the CIA, he mentioned the fact that Secretary of the Interior McKay had written a letter involving care of Indians. I did not quite clearly understand the attitude of the Secretary of the Interior. Will the Senator tell me exactly what it is?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say to my distinguished friend from North Dakota that I made a few remarks before speaking on Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, relative to the position in which the Indians on Hill 57 in Great Falls, Mont., were placed, and I quoted a letter from Secretary McKay which seemed to indicate that, so far as Indians off the reservation were concerned, there was not a great deal the Federal Government could do or that it intended to do for them.

As the Senator from North Dakota well knows, because he has been a true friend of the American Indian during his many years of service in the Congress, we think the Indians off the reservation are entitled at least to relief and succor when they are in need and when they are living in the deplorable circumstances under which they do live, not only in Montana, but in the State of North Dakota and elsewhere.

Mr. LANGER. I may say that the Secretary of the Interior is woefully ignorant of the real situation of the Indians, when he writes that kind of letter. Before the Senator began his remarks on the CIA, he mentioned the Turtle Mountain Reservation, for example, where five or six thousand Indians live on the land in two townships. The Indian Commissioner is saying that they should get jobs, so some of them have been working on the Garrison Dam. If the Indians stay on the reservation and become ill or if their families become destitute, it is the job of the Indian Commissioner to see that hospital facilities are provided and that the families are taken care of. But the moment an Indian goes 20, 30, or 40 miles away from home to get work, because there is no work on the Turtle Mountain Reservation, and he then becomes ill, it is apparently the position of Mr. McKay that the Indian should go to a private hospital and that the Government should not have to pay for his care.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. The result is that the Indians do not want jobs off the reservation, where, if they become ill and incur hospital bills, they will have to pay them, when, as the Senator from Mon-

tana well knows, the Indians can have hospital care free of charge upon the reservation.

What I have said about the Turtle Mountain Indians is true of the Indians on the Klamath Reservation in Oregon. It is true of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico. There are in the tribes in Arizona and New Mexico Indian veterans who offered their lives for the country. When I was conducting an investigation in those States, we were asked to make it possible for those Indians to obtain jobs on the reservation, by getting industries to locate on the reservations. The wives were saying that the husbands had to go three or four hundred miles away to get a job, and were not able to come home more than once a month, and families were being broken up. We were told that they had millions of acres of land, and that they wanted industries to be established on that land. The Government has not provided one single place on the reservation where Indians can get work. It is even worse than that.

Under the Truman administration—and I am a Republican, Mr. President—one Indian tribe received a loan of \$72,000 to enable them to buy cattle. An ordinary Indian veteran coming out of the service cannot get a loan from the Government. As the Senator from Montana well knows, he has no security, because the land in New Mexico and Arizona belongs to the tribes. There may be involved 1 million acres, or 1½ million acres, or 2 million acres, which amounts of land some of the tribes own, as the Senator from Montana well knows, but the Indian veterans who offered their lives for the Government cannot borrow a dollar from the Government. Under the Truman administration \$72,000 was loaned to a tribe. The tribe was getting along very well. It paid back every single dollar of the \$72,000 except one disputed item of \$160. Yet this Republican administration cuts out loans to the Indians and tells them, "Go two or three hundred miles away and get a job, if you can, but if you become ill," according to Secretary McKay, "it is too bad. You will have to pay your own bill, and will not be able to come back to a reservation hospital."

I wish to commend the Senator from Montana for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate this morning because the way these Indians have been abused is a disgrace to the United States Government.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think there is no question that one of the most shameful chapters in all our history is the way we have treated the American Indian from the very beginning. We are trying to get \$5 million appropriated for the Yellowstone Dam site project in the southeastern section of my State of Montana. Some persons are complaining that the Indians are being offered too much for this great and valuable natural resource. In the case of the Indians, I think we ought to recognize that it is better to lean over a little backward than to get right down to a matter of a minimum in dollars and cents. We owe these people so much that we shall never be able to repay them.

As a matter of fact, in the part of Montana to which I have referred, a little bit to the southeast, is the tribe known as the Northern Cheyennes. It is called the Race of Sorrows, because all they have known is poverty and illness since the white man took control of that area. It is in that area that there is a higher TB rate than in other section of our country. What has happened to the Northern Cheyennes has been duplicated at least in part in a great many of the Indian tribes of the United States.

Mr. LANGER. I cannot imagine that there is a tribe any worse off than is the Papago Tribe in Arizona. Dr. Salisbury testified after the hospital burned in 1947, that of every 100 Indian babies born each year 17 percent died before they were 6 years of age, 42 percent died before they were 16 years of age, and 52 percent died before they were 21 years of age. I cannot imagine an Indian tribe that would have a worse record than that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I can, so far as TB is concerned.

DELIVER US FROM EVIL—THE STORY OF THE RESCUE OPERATIONS IN NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the March issue of Reader's Digest contains a condensation of the book entitled "Deliver Us From Evil," written by Thomas A. Dooley, lieutenant, Medical Corps, United States Navy. The book relates some of the very interesting, worthwhile experiences of Lieutenant Dooley incident to the work performed by the United States Navy in transporting refugees from North Vietnam to South Vietnam. I call the attention of the Senate not only to the condensation of the book but, more important, to the book itself, which has just been published by Farrar, Straus & Cudahy, Inc.

Lieutenant Dooley has left the Navy. At present he is in Washington; and according to information I have received, he is preparing to return with a medical team to Vietnam to help the people there.

The book itself is inspiring. The work performed by Lieutenant Dooley and other American sailors in the rescue operations should be brought to the attention not only of Congress but of all the American people, as well. It should be noted that the armed services of our country on frequent occasions do many things which are not publicized or glorified. But certainly this humanitarian operation, which was responsible for transporting some 800,000 North Vietnamese to South Vietnam, and to freedom, is worthy of the consideration of the people of the United States. In this instance the American Navy did splendid, outstanding work under terrific conditions.

I take this means to salute the United States Navy, and especially I commend Lt. Thomas A. Dooley for the fine work he did personally, and for the inspiration his brand of ambassadorship and Americanism afforded the North Vietnamese as they were being transported to the south.

If the United States had abroad more ambassadors like Dr. Thomas A. Dooley, I think it not only would be better off, but would be better understood in the countries which are underdeveloped and which need understanding at this time.

His countrymen owe Tom Dooley a vote of thanks for his humanitarian efforts in behalf of a fine people who needed his help. We, in the Senate of the United States are proud of this fine American who has done so much for his country. We wish him Godspeed and good luck in the years ahead.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the condensation of the book, *Deliver Us From Evil*, written by Lt. Thomas A. Dooley, Medical Corps, United States Navy, containing a foreword by Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of United States Naval Operations.

There being no objection, the condensation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DELIVER US FROM EVIL

(By Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of U. S. Naval Operations)

FOREWORD

Every American will read with pride of the courageous exploits of young Lt. Tom Dooley, as told in *Deliver Us From Evil*, the story of an extraordinary rescue operation in turbulent, hostile North Vietnam. Through the tireless work of his small naval unit in a huge refugee camp, under arduous and challenging circumstances, Lieutenant Dooley won for the United States the love and admiration of thousands upon thousands of refugees on their desperate march to freedom.

The Navy's traditions have been built by generations of men like Lieutenant Dooley who were willing and able to act boldly and independently for the common good. The Navy is proud of such traditions and inspired by Lieutenant Dooley's historic contribution to them.

(By Thomas A. Dooley, Lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Navy)

One night last spring I lay sleepless and sweltering in the dying city of Haiphong, North Vietnam, asking myself the question that has taunted so many young Americans caught in faraway places: "What in hell am I doing here?"

None of the answers that came to mind seemed wholly satisfying. I was not on this weird bamboo curtain mission by compulsion. Each month the Navy offered me the chance to quit and go back aboard a nice clean ship and perhaps home. Yet each month I volunteered to stay on in this nightmare for still another 30 days. Why? In my depressed mood I cursed myself for a fool.

For as long as I could remember, I had wanted to be a doctor. Now, at 28, I was an M. D., although a very green one. Moreover, I was a Navy doctor, an added distinction I had coveted since serving as a hospital corpsman in the Navy in 1944-46. Finally, I was one young doctor who did not lack patients. God knows, I had more cases than any doctor could possibly handle.

Out there, in the makeshift refugee camp I had set up with United States Army tents, were more than 12,000 wretched, sick, and horribly maimed Vietnamese, most of them either very young or very old. They were fleeing from the Communists of North Vietnam, hoping to reach the doubtful security of Saigon. Before they came, more than 300,000 others had already passed through the camp. The number would exceed the half-million mark before the tragedy ended.

I was treating diseases that most of my classmates would never encounter in a life-

time's practice, performing operations which the textbooks never mention. What do you do for children who have had chopsticks driven into their inner ears? Or for old women whose collarbones have been shattered by riflebutts? Or for kids whose ears have been torn off with pincers? How do you treat a priest who has had nails driven into his skull to make a travesty of the crown of thorns?

Yes, cocky young Dooley, ticketed by the professors at medical school as a future "society doctor," was at last being educated, the hard way.

At Notre Dame the priests had tried valiantly to teach me philosophy. But out here in this Communist hellhole I had learned many more profound and practical facts about the true nature of man. I had watched tough United States sailors become tender nurses for sick babies and dying old women. I had seen inhuman torture and suffering elevate weak men to lofty heights of spiritual nobility. I knew now why organized godlessness can never kill the divine spark that burns within even the humblest human.

That night in Haiphong I tossed fitfully on my cot until, just before dawn, I heard Boatswain's Mate Norman Baker stumble into my tent. "Better get moving, Doc," he said. "We've got another batch—1,000 more." From Baker's tone, I could tell that the newcomers would be like all the rest—filthy, starving, diseased, and maimed in God knows what manner.

Groping for a flashlight and pushing my swollen feet into a pair of muddy boondockers, I instinctively began murmuring the Our Father, as I had every morning since childhood. " * * * and deliver us from evil * * * ." I had to pause in the darkness. You O God, that is the people's prayer—to be delivered from evil. At that moment I think I sensed, however dimly, the purpose behind my being there.

"Temporary" assignment

A brandnew Navy doctor, with the 1½ stripes of a lieutenant, junior grade, I was stationed at the United States naval hospital in Yokosuka, Japan, when the orders which got me into it came. Early in July 1954 I was temporarily assigned to the U. S. S. *Montague* AKA 98, for amphibious exercises. The duty seemed likely to be so brief that I allowed a Navy nurse in Yokosuka to drive my new convertible while I was gone, and told my roommate he could wear my best civilian suit. When I got back to Japan, 11 months later, there were 20,000 additional miles on the convertible's speedometer. As for the new suit—well, I couldn't have worn it anyway; I had lost 60 of my 180 pounds.

For a couple of weeks the amphibious exercises had us scrambling down landing nets and storming the sweltering beaches of the Philippines. But on August 12 task force 90 was ordered to "proceed to Haiphong, North Vietnam, anchor in stream and await instructions."

We could only guess the nature of the job before us. Vietnam, of course, suggested the latest tragedy in the Red engulfment of Asia—the fall of the fortress at Dien Bien Phu, the signing of a shameful treaty at Geneva, the partitioning of yet another country. Some of us had even heard that, under the terms of the treaty, the Vietnamese in the Communist north were guaranteed unmolested passage to the non-Communist south. Presumably, Task Force 90 would lend a hand.

The *Montague* was the first American ship to glide into the Baie d'Along. Soon other ships dropped anchor behind us. The historic "Passage to Freedom" was getting under way.

Beyond the bay lay the city of Haiphong, chief port on the Tonkin Delta, and then the last enclave of freedom in North Vietnam.

I stood on deck gazing at the distant, mysterious shoreline, wondering about our prospective human cargo.

Then I heard a shout, and saw the men pointing to a small craft heading toward us, bobbing like a little cork on the rough waters of the bay. We identified it as a French LCT. Such craft are designed to carry 4 or 5 tanks and a few dozen men; but when at last this one pulled alongside the *Montague*, I looked down with horror. Huddled there on the open deck, drenched by the sea and exposed to the cruel sun, were at least 1,000 human beings, many of them babies.

The adults had children on their backs and by the hand, and even the older kids toted babies. Across their shoulders they carried balance poles with shallow baskets at either end. There they had their meager belongings—clothing, rice bowls, heirlooms, and, invariably, a crucifix.

With the help of a French-speaking priest and the elders (whom we called mandarins), we tried to make the ship's rules known; then we herded the people aboard. As I watched them pass, I had to struggle to control the terrible nausea within me. They were filthy, scabrous, or covered with open sores. Many bore the disfigurements of inhuman treatment. From a dimly remembered course in tropical medicine I was able to recognize symptoms that said I had lots of work ahead of me.

But what struck me most was the look of fear, terror, and hostility in the eyes of everyone, young and old. These people were mortally afraid—of us.

Master-touch of evil

The LCT brought another load, and the embarkation was complete. The "ready to get underway" reports went to the skipper, and the *Montague* headed south. I immediately organized sick call. It ran almost continuously thereafter until we reached Saigon 3 days later.

Dr. Dooley now learned at first hand about diseases that had escaped him at school. On the first day I isolated 10 cases of smallpox. I saw yaws, leprosy, beriberi, elephantiasis, skin syphilis—and one case we mentioned only in a whisper: cholera.

In the *Montague's* sick bay I unearthed the secret behind the fear and hostility in the people's eyes. The priests and the mandarins, who had stood watching me for hours, finally told the story. These people were the victims of a master stroke of Communist evil, a fiendishly clever propaganda barrage.

The Vietnamese in the north had been conditioned to believe that to go south was sheer folly—suicide, or even worse. They were told that the Americans, even more than the despised French, were inhuman monsters. The mandarins reached into their sleeves and drew forth the evidence—a number of leaflets that purported to describe what would happen to refugees who took the "Passage to Freedom."

There were never more than 5 or 6 words on a sheet, but the skillfully drawn pictures conveyed the idea perfectly. One picture showed a group of American sailors squatting around a fire, cooking a Vietnamese baby on a spit. Another showed American naval officers at the foot of a gangplank checking off Vietnamese girls for the brothels of Saigon. There was even a picture of a Navy doctor vaccinating the people with deadly germs. But the prize was a graphic drawing of an LST-type ship that carried its passengers far out to sea, then opened its giant maw and spewed them overboard.

Now the mandarins shook their heads solemnly over the enormity of these lies, and apologized that the people had believed them. They promised to work diligently to correct or dispel the groundless fears.

When we reached Saigon, we helped the passengers gather up their babies and

bundles and prepare for the next stage of the journey into the unknown. They were still a sad lot, but somehow they seemed cleaner, brighter, braver than when they came aboard. Their bundles were heavier with all the extra rice, bread and flour that the sailors had pilfered from the galley. And what a joy it was to see a Vietnamese mother pat a young sailor on the head and say, "Tot lam"—"Very nice."

We had transported 2,001 people. There were two deaths, two burials at sea. Dr. Dooley had officiated at four births, mothers and babies all doing well—including one little guy who faces life burdened with the name, dreamed up by his proud parents: Thinh Van Montague AKA 98 Ngham.

Before turning in, I stood on deck congratulating myself on being a Navy doctor. "Dooley," I said, "you've seen and done things that are out of this world. You'll never have another experience to top this one in your whole lifetime."

That's what I thought.

Dr. Dooley "volunteers"

We returned to Haiphong, picked up another load of refugees, and made another and no less harrowing round trip—which was to be my last. By now the anchorage in the Baie d'Along was filled with ships. And one day I was invited aboard a newly arrived transport to give a sanitation briefing. While on deck I heard the ship's captain yelling orders in English to a French landing craft alongside. The French coxswain obviously knew no English, and the situation was beautifully fouled up. I speak French, so I decided to go to the bridge and make myself useful.

The skipper glared at me. "Later, doctor, Can't you see I'm busy?"

I cleared my throat. "Beg pardon, sir, but—"

"But, nothing. I told you—later."

There was fire in his eye. "Captain," I said plaintively, "I speak French. Thought I might help."

"Hell's bells, why didn't you say so?" he roared. "Tell that idiot to pull away and come alongside Chinese-fashion."

I shouted the orders in French, and the landing craft came around smoothly with its bow to the transport's stern. I got a grateful salute from the Frenchman and a gruff "Thank you" from the skipper. But as I left the bridge I noticed the calculating predatory look in his eye.

That started it. Word got around that young Dooley could speak French like a native. Soon I was performing all sorts of extra duties that had nothing to do with the practice of medicine. Then I was ordered aboard the flagship to report to Capt. James Grindell, force medical officer of Task Force 90.

Captain Grindell said he was organizing a preventive medicine and sanitation unit to be based in the port city of Haiphong. The place was inundated with refugees, and would soon be infested with all sorts of diseases, including the fancier tropical varieties. The local population would be exposed to plagues and epidemics; but even more serious, there was a strong likelihood of the diseases spreading to the city of Saigon in the south where we were depositing our uprooted humanity.

Then Captain Grindell laid it on the line. "Dr. Dooley," he said, "I'm considering attaching you to this unit as a medical officer and—well, as a sort of interpreter, let's say. You understand, of course, that this is a voluntary duty. Strictly voluntary. So make up your own mind."

When a man with four gold stripes on his arm, and speaking for the admiral, says that he is "considering" a junior lieutenant for something, the lieutenant doesn't have to think too long. I "volunteered."

Bright and early next morning I went aboard the flagship and met the four of-

ficers of the newly minted preventive medicine unit to be commanded by Capt. Julius Amberson. Captain Grindell read the orders, which said, among other things, that we were "to provide humanitarian care and medical attention for the refugees as they came within the orbit of our operation." Even at the time I wondered if we weren't a rather small company for such an ambitious undertaking. But I still didn't suspect that the "humanitarian care and medical attention" of a half-million refugees would soon become my responsibility alone.

"All right, gentlemen, that's it," Captain Grindell concluded. "Lots of luck to you."

We picked up our light kits (how light, O Lord) and went ashore.

Haiphong

Haiphong greeted us with heat, faded grandeur and a mélange of odors that smelled like the quintessence of all Asia. Unlike most port cities, it presents its best aspects on the waterfront, with beautiful modern wharves and warehouses. But after you pass a block or two of gracious homes and parks, the town degenerates rapidly into bazaars, flea markets and indescribable squalor.

Normally, the population was less than 100,000. When we arrived late in August 1954 it had been doubled, at least, by the gray tides of refugees sweeping into the city. They sprawled in the streets, gutters and alleys, and covered the parks like swarming ant heaps. Through this filth and confusion moved detachments of French sailors and Foreign Legionnaires, busily evacuating French military and civilian property from the doomed city.

We reconnoitered Haiphong's two hotels, the Paris and the Continental. One was as bad as the other, so we settled at the Continental in barnlike rooms furnished with faded upholstery and decrepit beds covered with mosquito netting. The place was infested with fighting cockroaches and rats that looked big enough to saddle.

Outside the hotel I had my first encounter with the only really engaging thing about Haiphong—the shoeshine boys. They were filthy, ragged, amusing little beggars, and accomplished thieves, who traveled through the town in small herds and slept on the street corners at night. Somehow we became fast friends. On that first day someone swiped a camera from my room; next morning I merely mentioned it to the shine boys, and by nightfall the camera was returned, as mysteriously as it had disappeared.

While trying to shine my rough combat boots (with a dozen kibitzers telling the shiner how the job should be done), they taught me my first phrases of Vietnamese—a simple, monosyllabic language which I soon spoke fairly well. They tried to pronounce my ridiculous name, but soon gave up. So it was the shine boys who first called me Bac Sy My (American Navy doctor), which henceforth was to be my Vietnamese name.

Later, when things got really rough, these ragged urchins became my dependable corps of volunteers, sleeping in the hotel corridor outside my door or fending for themselves in our camp, always ready to do my bidding as scouts, couriers, and rascals of mercy. During the last days of Haiphong, Roger Ackley of the Foreign Operations Administration watched these eager beavers operating and named them the "little dooleys." I felt deeply honored.

Building the camp

Under the terms of the Geneva Treaty which ended the Indochinese war 6 weeks earlier, Vietnam had been divided at the 17th parallel into two "temporary zones of political influence" until things could be settled by a national plebiscite slated for July 1956. Meanwhile, the southern half, with a population of 10 million, was to be ruled by the national government in Saigon; and the northern half, with a population of 12 million, con-

trolled by the Viet Minh Communists under the leadership of Ho Chi Minh.

An important clause in the cease-fire agreement provided that a crescent-shaped area around Haiphong at the mouth of the Tonkin Delta was to remain an "open zone to both parties." This was to serve as a staging area for the evacuation of those people in the north who preferred exile in South Vietnam to life under the Communists. The agreement was that these people were not only to be allowed but assisted to move south; and a mixed neutral commission, composed of representatives of Canada, Poland, and India, was created to supervise the evacuation.

But this small open zone around Haiphong was scheduled to shrink gradually, and on specified dates, until in the middle of May 1955 the entire area, including the city of Haiphong, would be in the hands of the Communists. Obviously, this was a tricky arrangement—just how tricky we would soon learn.

On our second day in Haiphong, Captain Amberson called me in and tossed a sheaf of notes and sketches at me. "Dooley," he said, "your job will be to build refugee camps. There's the general idea. Now get going. And don't bother me about the details."

"Aye, aye, sir," I said. But at that moment I didn't know the difference between a refugee camp and a summer playground for girls.

There was no suitable place in Haiphong for a refugee camp, but I found a reasonably good spot about 4 miles from town, on the road leading to Hanoi. We rounded up a gang of coolies and had them clear the area and dig drainage ditches to keep the place from floating away in the monsoon season. Then I yelled to Mike Adler, Haiphong agent of the Foreign Operations Administration (FOA) for tents and supplies.

I pulled a few prize boners—which Captain Amberson caught in time—like locating the latrine area on the windward side, and putting the water-purifying machinery too near the paddies the people used for other purposes. But we made amazing headway. Only a few days after we had asked for them, Mike Adler flew in my 150 tents from Japan—and prudently threw in 250 spares.

These were Army 60-man tents, but we made each one accommodate 120 refugees. I set them up in rows of 12, with drainage ditches on all four sides of each tent. The first row I reserved for my hospital area—a tent for sick call, a nursery for newborn babies, several supply tents, and 5 or 6 tents for sick patients. I also set aside one tent for the elders, or mandarins, who would act as camp leaders.

Beyond the last row of tents was the latrine area, and 12,000 people can present an enormous problem of daily waste disposal. Despite regular spraying and oil burning, the tents nearest the latrines quickly became uninhabitable. So I devised the system of regularly moving my hospital area forward and shifting the last row of tents to the front of the camp. In this way my camps literally walked toward Haiphong. Later, as the Viet Minh perimeter closed in around us, it was always my latrine area that I surrendered to the Communists.

If medals could be awarded to machines, I would recommend the highest honors for our water-purifying equipment. We had to produce 15,000 gallons of drinking water every day; and that spunky little unit ran for nearly 300 days with a minimum of faltering. The water was drawn from a rice paddy, passed through a sand filter and two chemical feed tanks, and finally through a chlorination gizmo before passing into the big 3,000-gallon rubber storage tank. This was Nuoc My (American water), which the refugees drank with obvious distaste. They much preferred the typhoid flavor of the water in the paddies.

I considered the water machinery a mechanical mystery, to be admired from a distance. Whenever something went wrong I gave Boatswain's Mate Baker my jeep and a carton of cigarettes, and in the voice of command I had learned from Captain Amberson I'd say: "Baker, get that damn thing fixed, and don't bother me with the details!"

Hours later Baker would return with a couple of Legionnaires, all full of cheap brandy and smoking American cigarettes. I never knew where the Frenchmen or the spare parts came from, but the water machine always became as good as new. And Baker always had a hangover.

On being an eager beaver

We processed and evacuated the refugees as quickly as we could. But new refugees kept streaming in, and sometimes we had as many as 14,000. Our primary job was to delouse, vaccinate and inoculate, and to screen out those who had communicable diseases. But there was more to it than that. At the sick-call tent I was seeing between 300 and 400 people every day who were desperately in need of medical treatment. What was I to do? Leave them in the camp to sicken and die? Send them back behind the Bamboo Curtain?

There is a service motto which says (approximately) that a man should keep his mouth shut, his internal system in order, and never volunteer. Fortunately, this is a rule seldom observed when things get tough. In my own case, the breach is widened by an Irish temperament that makes me stick my neck out.

"Doctor," I said to Captain Amberson, "we've got to do something for these sick people. We can't turn back a woman and child to the Communists just because the kid has, say, smallpox. We've got to treat the disease so the family can get aboard ship."

He looked at me wearily, but with obvious understanding. As a doctor he agreed with me, but he just felt sorry for the eager beaver who thought he could lick every problem.

"All right, Dooley," he said. "Do the best you can."

So we stepped up sick call, and I even enlarged my hospital tent for surgery. My enlisted men—some, like Baker, without previous training as corpsmen—learned to spot yaws at 10 paces, and they washed hideous sores, changed dressings, and slapped on ointments as if they had been doing it all their lives. I began treating dysentery, cholera, smallpox, typhoid, trachoma, worm infestations, fungus, and rabies. But soon I was almost floored by the surgical problems of traumatic injuries induced by fiendish torture.

For the kind of job I had undertaken I needed drugs and dressings and surgical equipment enough to stock a good-sized hospital. I had no authority to requisition the Navy for my needs; nor did the Navy, under the circumstances, have the authority to supply them. But there's always a way of doing things, and the Dooleys have never been cursed with false pride.

With hat in hand

I got what I could from the FOA by the simple expedient of having the Refugee Committee make the requisition (which was regulation) and then turn the supplies over to me. Then we went out to the ships and transports of Task Force 90 to practice what in the Orient is known as cumshaw but in plain American is called scrounging.

Perhaps we played upon the eternal curiosity of men afloat about what goes on ashore. But we had hair-raising tales to tell about conditions they were not allowed ashore to see, and each ship paid us off with what could be spared—a few vials of penicillin, a dozen bottles of vitamin pills, some dressings and bandages. By this means I built up a pretty good pharmacy.

But it still wasn't enough. My needs increased just as the main ships of the task force departed. That's when I stuck my neck out again, and sent Operation Hat-in-Hand stateside. I sat down and wrote letters to every pharmaceutical and surgical supply house that had ever sent me circulars or samples. I told them what I was up against, carefully stressing the fact that I was writing as an individual—Tom Dooley, M. D.—and not as an officer of the United States Navy.

God bless America. Those firms never stopped to investigate. They simply sent me posthaste what I asked. The Pfizer Laboratories of New York rushed 50,000 capsules of terramycin, and later shipments of streptomycin and penicillin. Meade-Johnson, of Evansville, Ind., sent a liquid vitamin preparation. A few drops make a dose, but they sent me gallons—a godsend. Pan American Airways sent 10,000 bars of soap. I wish I could name all those who gave so generously.

After that, whenever we used a medication we were careful to explain: "Day La Vien Tro My"—"This is American aid." And, believe me, those wretched people understood, and were grateful.

Operation Cockroach

By October Captain Amberson had been recalled to Washington and Lt. Comdr. Ed Gleason, a field sanitation expert, and the other officers had finished their chores and departed. Now I was the only remaining officer, with just four enlisted men to help me; Dennis D. Shepard, Peter Kessey, big Ed Maugre and stouthearted Norman Baker, who was to be with me to the bitter end.

Daily, I expected new brass to arrive and take over, but no one came. Much later I learned what had happened. Captain Amberson had said to Rear Adm. Lorenzo S. Sabin, the commander of Task Force 90: "The situation in Haiphong is pretty sticky, and the fewer men we have ashore the better. Young Dooley has the situation well in hand, and can carry on."

Sure enough, in mid-October orders came through designating me "Commander, Task Unit 90.8.6." I was pretty proud of my command until Communications advised us that, for security reasons, we would be known as Operation Cockroach.

There wasn't time to brood about this affront, however. The refugee horde pouring into Haiphong was increasing daily, and as the perimeter tightened, the people came through weaker and more diseased, and showing greater evidence of atrocities. The cease-fire guarantee of free and unmolested passage was now clearly a farce.

Still, the refugees didn't come hailing us as their deliverers. They were fearful, suspicious and sometimes hostile. We had to win them over. Sickness and suffering forced them to seek the hospital tents, so that I was kept busy from sunup to long after dark. But it was like operating in an amphitheater, for crowds gathered and watched every move I made. They wanted to see if I poisoned or mutilated people, as the Communists said.

Baker and I took some beatings at the hands of these misguided and hysterical people. But, remembering the importance of "face" in the Orient, we always were careful to take up where we left off.

One day a woman brought me a baby whose body was covered with ulcers. Yaw ulcers respond miraculously to penicillin: I gave the infant a shot in the buttocks and told the mother to bring it back next day.

A few hours later I heard shouts and curses, and saw the woman holding the baby aloft for the people to see. Here was proof that I was an American murderer. The child had reacted to penicillin with an angry-looking—but harmless—case of hives.

The distraught mother was in no mood for explanations. She handed her baby to a bystander, grabbed a pole, and called up a dozen sympathizers. When my corpsmen rescued

me at last, I had three broken ribs, two black eyes, and a lot of miscellaneous bruises.

Next day, with the whole camp watching, I went to the woman's tent alone and unarmed. As I expected, the hives had disappeared, and the ulcers were healing nicely. The woman burst into tears and fell at my feet begging forgiveness. She remained in the camp for weeks, serving as one of my helpers at sick call, always eager to exhibit her nice, clean baby. The effect on the other refugees was worth much more than a couple of fractured ribs.

Although my uniforms now consisted only of a few worn and faded shirts and trousers, I never appeared anywhere without a necktie and my dirty officer's cap, on which the eagle and anchors were corroded almost beyond recognition. This was partly for "face," and partly for carrying the flag. My corpsmen and I were determined to be one unit on foreign soil that would never fail to deliver what we called the American impact.

We constantly impressed upon the refugees that what we were doing for them was being done by the generosity of the American people.

"Yes, the gloves on your hands are good," one refugee would say. "But the eagle on your cap is bad."

"No, the eagle on my cap is good," I would answer. "Without the eagle there would be no doctor gloves. The eagle stands for America. America sends the Navy, which brings you the American Navy doctor. The American Navy takes you to safety in Saigon."

These arguments went on interminably at sick call. Sometimes I wished it were possible to work without talking. But this job had to be done.

Wrath of the godless

As the weeks passed I found myself increasingly puzzled, not only by the growing number but by the character of Communist atrocities. They seemed almost to have a religious significance. I was accustomed by now to patching up emaciated men, and women whose breasts had been mutilated, and even little children without fingers or hands. But more and more I was learning that these punishments were linked to the refugees' belief in God.

One night the shoeshine boys came as they did so often, to inform me that I was needed in a little village near the Bamboo Curtain. We drove about 10 miles in the truck, and they led me to a straw hut. Inside, by the light from a kerosene lamp, I saw an elderly couple and several children kneeling in prayer.

Then I saw a man lying on a bamboo stretcher, writhing in agony, his lips moving in silent prayer. When I pulled away the dirty blanket I found that his body was a mass of blackened flesh from the shoulders to the knees. The belly was hard and distended, and the scrotum swollen to the size of a football. I gave him a shot of morphine, and inserted a large needle in the scrotum in an attempt to draw off some of the fluid.

The old woman said the man was her brother, a Catholic priest, from a little town now within Communist territory. The Viet Minh had told him he could hold only one mass daily, at 6 a. m.—the hour when everyone had to gather in the village square for a daily lecture on the new life. When he persisted in saying mass secretly at night, the Communists decided that he needed re-education.

They hung him by his feet from the rafters of the church, so that his hands just barely touched the floor, and beat him with bamboo rods, concentrating on the genitalia. How long this went on he couldn't remember, but early the next morning the altar boys found him hanging there and cut him down.

They lashed together an arrangement of bamboo poles that could be carried as a litter

and floated as a raft. They hid the old priest near the riverbank. Then, after dark, they swam downstream towing the raft, and carried him to his sister's hut in the still-free zone.

Miraculously he survived the ordeal and for a time served as a chaplain of our camp.

On another gruesome day there came to my hospital tent seven little boys and an emaciated young man who was barely conscious. The children looked like zombies. Thick pus was running from their ears. Two of them still had queer-looking things protruding from their heads. Chopsticks.

We pleaded together the story. The young man was a schoolteacher. The Communists had caught him leading his class in the Lord's Prayer. They made him repeat it for them, line by line, and made a mockery of the words.

"Give us this day our daily bread * * *." Then they said to the children, "Who gives you bread? God? No; the state." When the lesson was ended they led the class into the schoolyard and taught the pupils a different kind of lesson.

Two Viet Minh guards held a child by the arms and another grasped his head. Then the leader rammed a chopstick deep into each ear, splitting the canal and shattering the inner ear. When all seven children had been "treated" the guards turned to the teacher. They drew forth his tongue with pincers and sawed it off with a blunt bayonet.

Somehow five of the children had managed to remove the chopsticks from their heads. I had to use an anesthetic before doing the job on the other two. There was little I could do for them but control the infection. The young teacher presented a greater problem. He had lost a great deal of blood and needed a transfusion, but I didn't have the equipment for it. I was able, however, to draw together the edges of his tongue stump and patch it up. Penicillin and the hand of God took care of the rest.

The 8 survived—1 young man who never again would pray aloud, and 7 children who would hear the word of God only in their hearts.

Mother of a thousand

When my spirits were unusually low, I would get in my jeep after sundown and drive into Haiphong to the An Lac (Peace) Orphanage, where there was always laughter.

Usually there would be other guests for dinner—the French admiral, a few officers of the Foreign Legion or some Haiphong dignitary. But all observed two rules of the house: (1) you ate what was set before you, always a Vietnamese menu, which might consist of fish heads, bat-wing soup, a paste made of sparrows' eyes, or raw pork mixed in ancient fish oil; and (2) you never mentioned war or politics. The latter rule was rigidly enforced by our hostess—Madame Vu Thi Ngai—mother of a thousand children.

Madame Ngai was one of the most remarkable women I shall ever meet. She must have been in her 60's; but with her jet-black hair (dyed), fine-textured skin, wide-set black eyes and beautiful white teeth, she could easily pass as a fashionable 40. She was a big, beautifully proportioned woman, and her ample bosom seemed always to be shaking with laughter.

I became even more devoted to Madame Ngai when I learned her story. She had been a woman of great wealth, with a beautiful home and much land in Thanh Hoa, in southern Tonkin. But Thanh Hoa was one of the first towns ravaged by the Viet Minh in 1946. Madame Ngai's husband was killed, and her home partially destroyed.

She went through Thanh Hoa gathering up waifs and orphans and brought them to her home—the nucleus of the An Lac Orphanage. When the Viet Minh came a second time, Madame Ngai gathered up her brood and fled

to Nam Dinh, perhaps 50 miles away. She had only her jewelry and some blocks of gold leaf. But she bought another house in Nam Dinh for her orphans—by now she had 600.

During the next 6 years the An Lac Orphanage was to move five times, from town to town, always a few days ahead of the Communists, until Madame Ngai and company reached Haiphong in 1954. By this time the jewelry was gone, and the hoard of gold leaf was perilously low; but she acquired a house big enough to accommodate her orphans. The first time I made a count in the summer of 1954 they numbered 1,089.

The Americans came into her life in August 1954, and she captivated even those who couldn't understand her exquisite French—including my old chief, Captain Amberson. When he left Haiphong his last words were: "Don't neglect those kids at Madame Ngai's." And that was one of Captain Amberson's orders that Dooley obeyed to the letter.

A leg for lovely Lia

After dinner, while the Frenchmen regaled their hostess with tall tales, I would take my bag and make the rounds of the An Lac Orphanage. There was enough disease and infirmity among these kids to give a man a complete residency in pediatrics, and my visits were busy ones. But there was always time for play, particularly with a favorite pal of mine, little Nguyen.

No one knew Nguyen's last name; he was an abandoned infant when Madame Ngai plucked him from a roadside, and now he was 5. But tuberculosis of the spine had made him one of the most misshapen hunchbacks I've ever seen. He could barely waddle around. He couldn't sit at all, and had to take his meals lying down. Most of the time he just rolled on the floor, but he was always laughing. I once took him aboard an American ship, and when I got him ashore I found that he had swiped 3 sailor caps and 5 cigarette lighters.

But my special love was reserved for Lia, one of the older girls. Since she was now 7, Lia took care of the babies for Madame Ngai, and she looked like a solemn little oriental doll as she went about her duties in the nursery. Still, that was pretty hard work for a 7-year-old who had to get about on a roughhewn crutch. Lia's right leg had been blown off by the land mine that killed both her parents.

When I first visited the orphanage in August 1954, I examined Lia's stump. It was badly healed, with some raw and granulated patches. With minor surgery I got a good secondary closure. Then I asked Lia if she would work with me patiently to make the stump strong, and she said she would because she loved her Bac Sy My. So I taught her how to soak, stretch, and exercise it daily, and by Christmas we had a good, functional stump.

Meanwhile, I had written to A. S. Aloe, a surgical-supply house in St. Louis, describing the case and giving measurements in detail. But Lia was a growing girl, and what she needed was an adjustable limb that could grow with her. That company couldn't fill the bill and consulted the McCarthy-Hanger Co. Then the two of them got together and found a third outfit, in New Jersey, that could produce what we needed.

Several months later Lia's American leg arrived in Haiphong. I put it on her, and, holding onto my hand, she walked for the first time. She smiled radiantly, and then she burst into tears—and Madame Ngai, Boatswain's Mate Baker, and I all burst into tears, too. Everybody was happy.

Now all proper Tonkinese females wear long black trousers which reach to the ankles; and little Lia was probably the most modest child you could find. But for a week after she got her leg she refused to wear any pants at all. One night I came to the orphanage late and tiptoed through the rooms

to look at a couple of sick kids. I found Lia asleep on her cot, still wearing the limb.

I woke her. "You must not do this, Lia," I said. "I told you how important it is for you to take care of that stump."

She looked at me with real hurt in her sleepy eyes. "When I sleep," she said, "I do not remove by Vietnamese leg. Why must I take off my American leg?"

Cosmo Invidiato, head of the Cosmevo Surgical Supply Co., in New Jersey, which made Lia's leg (free of charge), wrote "From what I can read between the lines of your letter, conditions must be horrible for the people of that faraway country. It is difficult for us here to understand the sacrifices those people are making and the hardships they are undergoing constantly. Sometimes we fall to musing on our complete uselessness. Perhaps we should all try a little harder. * * *

We can never repay Mr. Invidiato. But I did send him a little roll of movie film showing Lia and her American leg. And Lia says she remembers him in her prayers each night, and will always.

The days get darker

I seldom made the 4-hour boat trip to the ships in the Baie d'Along any more. With Viet Minh infiltrators itching for trouble, our launches no longer made the trip after dark; and the daylight hours were my busiest. But the lure of a hot bath and a good meal often seemed irresistible. Once I succumbed and, via my walkie-talkie, requested the command ship's helicopter.

When the skipper asked me what was up, I answered boldly, "Sir, I am in desperate need of a hot bath and a decent meal." He merely chuckled. The whole task force knew about Dooley's bathing difficulties, having heard about the time I went aboard the flagship and was invited to luncheon by Admiral Sabin.

I was wearing my tattered khaki shirt and trousers, my hands were stained red with merthiolate, and I needed a bath. Nevertheless, with all those high-ranking officers present, the admiral seated me at the end of the long table, directly facing him. I was obviously flattered, but he brought me up short. "Don't get any ideas, Doctor," said the admiral. "You just smell so bad I want you as far away as possible."

Now the days were getting darker. I was racked by malaria, and had acquired some intestinal parasites that ate more than I did. I was down to skin and bones, and low in spirits. Many times I determined to take up Admiral Sabin on his monthly offer to send someone to replace me, but in my heart I knew I wanted to see this through to the end.

The atrocities were beginning to get me down, and some of them I could never become inured to. One day the shoeshine boys informed me that Father Lopez at the Philippine mission in Haiphong needed me at once. O Lord, I thought, another mutilated priest. But, whatever I expected, I had underestimated the fiendish imagination of godless men.

Father Lopez led me to a tiny room off the mission courtyard. Lying on a straw mat was an old man, moaning in delirium. His head was covered with foul green pus. When I washed it away, I counted 8 swollen and badly infected wounds encircling his skull. In this instance Communist re-education had consisted of tying the priest's hands behind his back and driving eight nails into his skull to simulate the crown of thorns.

The old man had managed to drag himself to a hut, where the peasants had dislodged the nails and then brought him to Haiphong. I gave him tetanus toxoid and huge doses of penicillin, drained the pus pockets and dressed the wounds. He made a remarkable recovery.

But one morning I arrived and found his straw pallet unoccupied. The old priest had disappeared in the night. The note he left for Father Lopez merely said that he had to get back to his flock behind the Bamboo Curtain.

And I remember the day they brought me a number of young boys who had escaped from the town of Bao Lac, near the China border. The Communists had caught them at the perimeter, but had let them pass—after tearing an ear off each young head with plincers.

I trimmed the stumps, dissected the surface of the external canal and sutured the skin of the scalp and face. But the tension on the suture line was so great that I knew those kids would always bear hideous scars.

The horror of experiences like these might have been overwhelming but for the fact that there just wasn't time to dwell upon them. All around us things were coming to a slow boil.

The little hero

One morning Capt. Jerome Cauvin, of the French Navy, who was in charge of patrolling the waters around Haiphong, called to tell me that a seaplane had just sighted several sampans, apparently lashed together, floating mysteriously far out in the Baie d'Along. He was going out on a landing craft. Did I want to go along?

I joined him on the LSM, and 3 hours later we reached the sampans. There were 14 of them, and they were adrift under the blinding noon sunlight because none of the more than 1,000 people we found aboard had strength enough left to navigate.

I clambered from sampan to sampan, examining the most miserable humans I have ever seen. There wasn't much I could do for them right then. They were all green from seasickness, cold and stiff from exposure, their feet and ankles swollen from long immersion, and skin cracked by constant salt spray and blazing sun. We took as many as we could aboard the LSM, and towed the rest back to Haiphong in the sampans.

Captain Cauvin and I found several elders and brought them to the cabin for hot tea. The mandarins told their story in a sad, weary monotone that came to life only when they mentioned the name of Mai Van Thinh, a 12-year-old lad who will always be remembered as the great hero of Cua Lo.

Cua Lo, the old men said, was a little seaside village 300 kilometers south of Haiphong. It had always been a happy place, made fairly prosperous by heavy hauls of fish and good crops from the rich, well-irrigated paddies inland. The people from Cua Lo spoke nostalgically of the French, for, under the French, life had not been so bad.

Then the Communists had taken over Cua Lo, bringing the bright promises of Viet Minh nationalism. The mandarins shook their heads sadly. "They gave us land reform, and it brought only famine," an old man said. "They carted away our fish, which we needed for food. They tried to teach us the new sociology, which we found meant family denunciation, self-criticism, fear, distrust. Oh, it was very bad."

The people of Cua Lo had only one desire: escape. But the newly appointed Viet Minh commissar was determined to keep them captive and had acquired a small garrison of Viet Minh guards.

So escape plans were made secretly and passed in whispers. Food and water were smuggled aboard the sampans bit by bit. Finally, a moonless night was set for the departure. There was only one loophole in the plan: someone would have to divert the Viet Minh guards from the waterfront while the people boarded the sampans. That was when little Mai Van Thinh volunteered.

The youngster was the sole survivor of an old Cua Lo family. His father and mother had been killed in the war. His older brother,

Cham, denounced by the Viet Minh as the leader of the local Christian Youth Movement, had been tied to a tree, drenched with gasoline, and burned alive.

Mai offered to remain behind to divert the guards. This was a desperate gamble, but it was Cua Lo's last hope.

On the appointed evening, 1,156 people huddled in the darkness awaiting the signal. Then, on the far side of town, all hell broke loose. Fires started in widely separated places. Mai Van Thinh raced through the village, a screaming phantom, with the entire garrison trying to pin him down. And 1,156 men, women, and children quietly boarded the sampans and slipped away into the dark. One doesn't like to think what must have happened to Mai Van Thinh in the end.

The voyage on the open China Sea took 5 nights and 5 days. Without navigation instruments, and most of the time without food or water, it was a miracle that these refugees ever reached the waters off Haiphong. But now, down in the well deck of the LSM, there were signs of life. The people were softly signing a hymn. One of the mandarins repeated the words for us: "O Lord, we love the beauty of Thy house, and the place where Thy glory dwells. Provide that our days may be spent in peace with Thee."

Evidence from Phat Diem

As the Communist perimeter closed in around Haiphong, there was no longer any doubt that it was being heavily policed. The only people who reached the evacuation zone were those who escaped into it at their peril. The less fortunate were being held captive behind the bamboo curtain. All this, of course, was in flagrant violation of the Geneva agreements.

The International Control Commission (known, from its French title, as CIC) was supposed to see that the Geneva terms were carried out. The CIC was genuinely feared by the Communists. While it had no enforcement powers, it could report violations to Geneva and call upon world opinion. Also, it had mobile teams that could go anywhere, freely and secretly, to investigate conditions. What, then, was wrong?

You must remember that the CIC was a "mixed neutral" commission. Canada, the only truly democratic member, worked valiantly, but at great disadvantage. India was painfully neutral. Poland, of course, was Communist. And the Poles were past masters of obfuscation.

Many times I sent atrocity cases before the CIC in Haiphong. After hours of wrangling, the hapless refugees would be sent back to camp. The Polish member always demanded impossible proof that the people who committed the atrocities were Communists.

For example, we knew that things were pretty bad in Thai Binh, one of the larger cities of the Tonkin. The CIC mobile team went there, secretly. But somehow a "fix" was made. The team held hearings, and the people gave testimony—under the eyes of their Viet Minh masters. So CIC reported back that things were just fine in Thai Binh! The people were happy and prosperous, and no one had the slightest interest in the "passage to freedom."

Captain Cauvin planned a test case and asked our help. We chose the town of Phat Diem, about 50 miles south of Haiphong, because some of my refugees insisted that at least 30,000 people there wanted to escape and couldn't. A few of the strongest, bravest men and women agreed to go back to Phat Diem with this message: "If you want to escape, gather in the churchyard on November 1, the Feast of All Saints. The International Control Commission will visit you there. You will be able to make your declaration, and perhaps gain your freedom."

Meanwhile, Adm. Jean Marie Querville of the French Navy, Admiral Sabin of Task

Force 90, powerful Gen. "Iron Mike" O'Daniel in Saigon, and many French and Vietnamese dignitaries used their influence to insure that the CIC would be on hand in Phat Diem on the appointed date. But, as always, something went wrong.

People from all over the canton flocked to the church on November 1. But the CIC team just couldn't make it. Admiral Querville offered them his helicopter, although they had two planes of their own. But they couldn't leave that day, nor the next, nor the next!

In Phat Diem the Viet Minh became suspicious of this prolonged mass observance of the holy day. They ordered the people to go home, but the people refused. So the Viet Minh locked the gates, stationed guards and allowed no food or water to be passed into the churchyard.

The siege went on for 3 days, 6, then 9. The people in the church and churchyard grew weaker, and the walling of starving children pierced the nights. Hunger, thirst, dysentery and worse diseases cut the people down. Finally, on the 10th day, the CIC team arrived.

A Canadian told me later that even the Poles were appalled by the horror and filth. The CIC took thousands of declarations, and registered a strong protest with the Viet Minh government in Hanoi. The Viet Minh relented—but how.

They set up 4 offices, capable of processing only a hundred people a day. The first office issued passports. The second sold (!) bus tickets to Haiphong at exorbitant prices. And so it went. Not until the 15th of November did the first small group leave Phat Diem. The Viet Minh chose a circuitous route to Haiphong. En route the buses "broke down." During the delays lecturers told the people that they were going to French and American atrocity camps.

Some of the people were transferred to sampans and taken upriver to Hanoi, the Red capital, there to await transportation by truck or train to Haiphong. And, more often than not, they learned that their exit permits had "expired" during these interminable delays.

By our final count, about 5,000 people from Phat Diem gained their freedom—out of 35,000 who made the attempt. Yet those 5,000 people owe a debt of gratitude to Captain Cauvin, the gallant Frenchman who had the courage and determination to toss the Big Lie back into Communist teeth.

Goodby, little Dooleys

April came, and Haiphong was dying block by block. The tightening Communist perimeter had pushed us almost into the heart of the city. The French troops had left, riots were breaking out and one fear began to haunt us all: that Ho Chi Minh, the Viet Minh leader, might take Haiphong before the appointed hour. The time had come to evacuate the An Lac Orphanage.

Madame Ngai perked up perceptibly when we told her that the American Wives' Club in Saigon had assured the future of the orphanage there. Of course, we fibbed a bit—for there was no assurance of anything in Saigon's future; but the American wives had found a building for the children, and we just had to pray that they and their friends at home would somehow make up for the resources Madame Ngai no longer possessed.

So we packed up the orphanage in toto—cribs, cots, bedding, medicine, and toys—and trucked it down to the landing. The children filed aboard the French LSM that would take them out to the U. S. S. General Brewster—the babies in the arms of the older girls, under the vigilant eyes of the little mother, Lia; and my carefree pal Nguyen, wearing his white cap cocked over one eye, in the arms of an American sailor.

Madame Ngai was leaving her beloved Tonkin for the first time, forsaking cherished

roots and a way of life she probably would never see again. But hope springs eternal. "We Tonkinese are a brave and militant people," she said. "We know the day will come when our country will be liberated from the Viet Minh. Of that we have no doubt."

Farewell, noble lady. With women such as you to keep the flame alive, no nation can die; surely there will be a new birth of freedom.

We stood there watching until the LSM was only a dot on the horizon. I have never felt so abysmally alone.

I had one more difficult task to perform. The shoeshine boys had to go. For months they had resisted every argument I put in favor of Saigon. I warned them that the Communists were just as hard on thieves as on honest men, and that life under the Viet Minh would be impossible. They only leered at me, as if to say that, after all this time, I still didn't appreciate their skills as artful dodgers.

What convinced them finally, I think, was the matter of shoes. The idea came to me in a flash one day. "Well," I said, "you might as well throw those kits away. There'll be no more shoeshining when the Viet Minh arrive. Or do you think you can make a shine on canvas shoes?"

It was a telling argument. They looked at each other in dismay. From their frequent forays behind the Bamboo Curtain, they knew that canvas sneakers were standard equipment among the Viet Minh. They let me vaccinate them then, and one April morning Baker and I gave the little dooleys a loaf of bread each and a final delousing, and watched them shoulder their shoeshine kits and sullenly file aboard the landing craft.

They arrived safely in Saigon, and I'm sure that city hasn't been the same since.

The conquerors come

The advance guard of the Viet Minh arrived on May 4, according to schedule. It was a committee of experts, 480 strong. They came in brandnew, Russian-made Molotova trucks, and were impeccably dressed in high-collared gray uniforms, pith helmets, and canvas shoes.

The French-speaking leaders were extremely polite and respectful. They urged me to stay on and treat the "true people of Vietnam." I replied that my job was just about over, and that I expected to be leaving soon.

They sent a delegation out to the camp and gave me a bit of dialectical materialism.

"When you treat sick people in America," the leader asked, "do you make any distinction between Democrats and Republicans?"

"Certainly not."

"Very well," he said, "there must be no distinction here between capitalistic dupes and the loyal people of Vietnam."

Then the cheeky so-and-so ordered his men to divide up my pharmaceuticals and surgical supplies—half for me, and half for the "Democratic Republic" of Vietnam. And there wasn't a thing I could do about it.

We took down the tents of our camp and moved the last of our refugees into empty buildings in the heart of Haiphong. May 12 was to be our last loading day, which would bring the total number of evacuees above 600,000. On that morning I had my last grisly experience in Haiphong.

A rickshaw driver rushed up with a teenage boy he had picked up in an alley. Viet Minh guards had seized the kid as he was crossing the line of the demilitarized zone, and stomped their rifle butts on his bare feet. I had no X-ray equipment, but it was obvious that the damage was beyond repair. The feet and ankles felt like moist bags of marbles, and were already gangrenous. I had only a few instruments left, and a little procaine and penicillin. I did the best I could by disarticulating the ankles where they connect with the lower leg. Someone

would have to do a more thorough amputation later.

That was my last surgery in Haiphong. We got the boy aboard a boat. Then we turned to the job of loading the landing craft with our last 3,600 refugees. They weren't really the last, of course. There were still several million behind the Bamboo Curtain who never had a chance. But we had done the best we could. And I hope the men who made the deal at that lovely Geneva lakeside are happy with the results.

On the morning of May 18 we stood by solemnly as Gen. René Cogen hauled down the French flag from the standard where it had flown for nearly a hundred years. Thus an era ended. Haiphong was dead, and awaiting the Red vultures. Operation Cockroach was forgotten in the shambles of Asia.

A very important person

When we arrived in Saigon, Capt. Harry Day, chief of the Navy section of the Military Assistance Advisory Group there, provided me with a hot tub and a tall gin-and-tonic, and gave me all the scuttlebutt from Task Force 90.

Then he said: "Dooley, we must find you a clean uniform. You're due at the palace tomorrow morning."

Next day the Premier (now President of the Republic) Dinh Diem, decorated me with the medal of Officier de l'Ordre National de Vietnam. Our medical assistance had not only saved many lives for his people, he said, it had also shown them the true goodness and spirit of cooperation that America is showing Vietnam and all the countries of the world who seek to achieve and maintain their freedom. "My people," he concluded, "will long remember their Bac Sy My, his work, and his love."

I went aboard ship and to sick bay now—this time as a patient. My monthly bout with malaria was on, and I had a temperature of 104. When I reached the hospital in Japan, my colleagues ("Where have you been, Dooley?") were less interested in my medal than in my intestinal parasites, which they said were the most interesting they'd ever seen.

The Navy awarded me the Legion of Merit and, after I had been patched up, told me to report to Washington. When I stopped at Pearl Harbor en route I was taken to the headquarters of Adm. Felix Stump, commander in chief in the Pacific, and asked to brief his staff on my experiences in Vietnam. Although I had never seen so much high brass assembled before, I talked for an hour. Then, at the insistence of one of the admirals, I spoke for 30 minutes more about the constructive things we might do in the remaining free areas of southeast Asia. My words may have been brash, but they came from the heart. And I knew they couldn't bust a medical officer any lower than a lieutenant, junior grade.

Afterward, a very spit-and-polish young officer, Ensign Potts (I've changed his name), introduced himself as my aide. "The admiral has ordered VIP treatment for you while you're in Pearl Harbor, sir," he said. "I'm supposed to see that you get it."

Ensign Potts baffled me. He saluted me every time I turned around. When we got into "my" staff car, I would invite him to sit with me. "Thank you, sir," he'd say—and climb in with the driver.

Well, if I was a VIP, I would use my VIP privileges. "Mr. Potts," I said, "there's a sailor somewhere in this yard—Norman Baker, aviation boatswain's mate, third class. I think he's aboard the *Philippine Sea*. Have him in the lobby of the Royal Hawaiian in the morning. Don't mention my name—just 'the admiral's orders.'" Potts gave me an icy stare and said, "Aye, aye, sir."

Next morning I was in the lobby waiting for the fun. A bewildered Baker, looking slick in clean whites, came through the door.

"Over here, sailor," I called. He looked, and then let out a yell. "Eeyow—Dooley—beg pardon, Dr. Tom, sir—you sure look like hell." Then we forgot rank and fell on each other's necks.

We enjoyed the best the Royal Hawaiian had to offer that day, and talked for hours about what seemed like the distant past, and about the shoeshine boys and Madame Ngai and Lia and the kids. Then we raised a final glass to an undying friendship. Good old Baker. I was happy to hear later that the Navy awarded him a letter of commendation—an honor he richly deserved.

Baker, a boatswain's mate by grade, was really assigned to me as an interpreter, but he became an excellent medical corpsman. Like so many of the 15,000 officers and sailors of Admiral Sabin's task force, Baker was resourceful, steadfast and never ran out of genuine compassion. Some days my Irish personality would have me wallowing in despair. Baker always pulled me back. He would do any job assigned him, no matter how distasteful. And he would do it well. His sense of humor got him through, and frequently me too. The success of the operation owes much to that boatswain's-mate-become-corpsman, Norman Baker. The greatest tribute I can pay him is to say that, within all the glory of our tradition, he is a fine American Navy man.

But Ensign Potts was getting on my nerves. We were on our way to Hickam Air Force Base to get my number for the flight home. "Mr. Potts, get in the rear seat," I said. "That's an order." He obeyed stiffly.

"Potts, what the hell's wrong with you—or with me?" I asked. "I get along with most people—but you baffle me. What gives?"

"May I speak frankly, sir?"

"Hell's bells, yes."

He opened up. "Well, I can't go for this hogwash you're handing out," he said. "All this love and altruism and better understanding among people. That's not the Navy's job. We've got military responsibilities in this cockeyed world. Big responsibilities. We've got to perform our duties without sentiment. That's what we've been trained for. Love and kindness and slobbering over people is a job for preachers and old women."

He said a lot more that made me shudder. But at least he got it off his chest. I think we both felt better.

Reunion in Hawaii

I got my flight number and was pushing my way back through the crowded terminal when I heard a high-pitched voice: "Chao Ong, Bac Sy My" (Hi, American Navy Doctor). Then a pair of strong arms were around me, and a young Vietnamese was blubbering on my shoulder. About 2 dozen more gathered around and joined in the chorus. I noticed that they were all wearing the uniform of the Vietnamese Air Force.

"Don't you remember me, Bac Sy My?"

Who could remember one from among those half-million faces? Then I noticed—the boy had no left ear. I looked at the others and recognized the hideous scars wrought by Viet Minh cruelty and my own poor ineptness.

"Of course, I remember," I said. "You boys come from Bao Lac." They told me that they were on their way to Texas to be trained as mechanics for the new Vietnamese Air Force.

Quite a crowd, mostly Americans, had been attracted by his highly emotional scene. This was as good a time as any to begin "briefing" my fellow citizens. So I spoke up and told the onlookers what it was all about. I told them where I had come from, a little of what I had seen, and then I satisfied their curiosity as to why some of these air cadets had only one ear apiece. When I finished I was choking back the tears—but there wasn't a dry eye in the crowd.

I turned and looked at Ensign Potts, and saw the tears running unashamedly down his cheeks. "Mr. Potts," I said, "pull yourself together, sir." He came over, grinning through the tears, and wrung my hand. Ensign Potts had discovered the power of love.

I learned that the Vietnamese cadets were caught in the inevitable foul-up. They had been on the field for days with no one to look after them. Since they knew no English, they had never found the mess hall, and they were hungry. I sought out the Air Force officer in charge; he just shrugged and told me the kids were due to leave on a flight that night. I told him I wanted to be put aboard the same plane.

"Well, now, wouldn't that be nice, Lieutenant?" he sneered. "That way you could get home a bit ahead of time, eh?"

The Irish in me boiled, but it wasn't necessary. Ensign Potts moved in with all guns blazing.

"Sir, Dr. Dooley is Admiral Stump's guest, and I have the authority to speak for the admiral," he roared. "The doctor can have anything he wants, including the admiral's own plane. Seems to me the least the Air Force can do is put him on that lousy flight."

And the Air Force did. Roger.

Old Dr. Dooley speaks

The big Constellation was filled with soldiers, sailors, and marines, and—aside from the crew—I was the only officer aboard. When we were airborne, I decided to have some fun. I stood up and told the men that they were in for a lecture, and that they'd have to listen because there was no way of getting out of it at 10,000 feet. They all groaned.

I called up my 26 cadets one by one, and asked each to tell his story while I translated. My captive audience was entranced. Then I asked the cadets to sing some of their mountain songs. Tonkinese music is hauntingly beautiful, something like the ancient Hebrew liturgical chants. The men listened with rapt attention, and afterward sang American songs for the cadets. The Vietnamese loved Shake, Rattle, and Roll the best. Translate that.

That night, high over the Pacific, new bonds of friendship were formed which surmounted the barriers of language. When we finally came in over the Golden Gate the Americans had given up their seats at the windows to the Vietnamese and were excitedly trying to explain the sights by gestures and sign language. And at Travis Air Force Base I watched them file off the plane, each sailor and marine with a cadet in tow.

While I was on the west coast, I decided to visit a high school in San Diego. Its senior class had sent my refugees bundles of clothes, and I wanted to thank the various people and organizations who had responded to Operation Hat-in-Hand. Of course, that senior class was gone now. But the principal and teachers buzzed around, and I found myself scheduled to address the assembled classes of several San Diego schools.

I looked out over that sea of young faces and felt older than Father Abraham. They were noisy kids, dressed in faded blue jeans and leather jackets, some of the girls in full-blown sweaters and many of the boys with long duck-butt haircuts. When I stepped out on the platform, wearing my uniform and ribbons, there was a bedlam of wolfcalls, whistles and stomping feet.

They were tough, so I decided to shoot the works. I gave them the whole sordid story of the refugee camps, the Communist atrocities, the "Passage to Freedom" and the perilous future of southern Vietnam. I talked for an hour. You could have heard a pin drop.

When I was through, they asked questions, earnest, intelligent questions that kept me on my toes. One little girl, who couldn't have

been more than 13, had to come down front in order to be heard. She took a wad of gum from her mouth before asking her question with intense seriousness.

"Dr. Dooley, what can we boys and girls really do to help improve the situation in Southeast Asia?"

Dear little girl, put back your gum, and don't be ashamed. Your heart's in the right place. I haven't met a single American who hasn't asked something like that after hearing the facts. But it's a tough question to answer.

We all want to help, but we don't know how. I guess we're all like Ensign Potts, more or less: we need only to glimpse the truth, and then the scales fall from our eyes. Only then do we begin to realize the extent of our obligations and opportunities. We lose our inhibitions, and we're no longer afraid to speak of love, compassion, generosity. Christ said it all in the three words of His greatest commandment: "Love one another."

I have no magic formula to offer. I know nothing about foreign aid in billion-dollar packages. But I do know that American aid, used wisely and generously by individual hands on a people-to-people basis, can create bonds of friendship that will be hard to sever. And we have several million willing American hands around the world if we want to use them.

Not the Navy alone, but all the services overseas. They're all made up of Bakers and Ambersons and Gleasons—we were not unique. Men in uniform have primary duties to perform in the national defense. But without neglecting those responsibilities we can still serve the folks back home—if they want us to—as instruments of the sympathy, generosity, and love that are hallmarks of the American character.

Unless those intangibles are conveyed to people plainly, however, I'm afraid the costly programs of material aid are often wasted. They needn't be. My meager resources in Indochina did not win the people's hearts, although they helped. What turned the trick were those words "Day la vien tro my" ("This is American aid")—and all that those words conveyed.

I believe that in the long run such plain help can be the decisive factor in bringing about victory for all the sacred things we stand for.

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks on Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, a resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, there be inserted in the RECORD a number of newspaper editorials and articles on the proposal to establish such a joint committee and also letters of approval of the resolution by the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report in the western area of the United States and a letter signed by Mr. Clarence Francis, chairman of the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report, both of which are in favor of the adoption of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today the Senate is considering Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, a concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence. I have introduced similar measures on two previous occasions. However, this is the first time the proposal has come to the floor of the Senate for consideration. The concurrent resolution the Senate is considering today was cosponsored by 34 of my distinguished colleagues in the Senate.

The events of the past year have made it imperative that such a committee as is proposed be authorized before the adjournment of Congress this summer. This concurrent resolution was reported to the Senate by a majority of the members of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

To begin with, let me say that because of the very nature of the Central Intelligence Agency, I think it is important that a joint congressional committee be established for the purposes of making continued studies of the activities of the Agency and problems related to the gathering of intelligence affecting the national security. The Hoover Commission recommendations, the recent Presidential appointment of a commission to study CIA, the conflict over the site of the new CIA headquarters building, and other incidents in the past year have only intensified my interest in seeing that such a committee is established by the Congress.

I feel that a joint congressional committee should be established and that the CIA should, as a matter of law, keep that committee as fully and as currently informed as possible with respect to its activities.

Allen Dulles, Director of CIA, may make no mistakes in assessing intelligence, but he should not be the lone judge in matters which have to do with the intentions of other nations with respect to war and peace.

Mr. President, as you know, the President recently appointed an eight-man board to review periodically the Nation's intelligence activities. This is a step forward, but not far enough to reach the goal which I and the cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 seek.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wonder if the Senator will make a brief statement at this time with regard to the nature of the jurisdiction of the proposed committee and the relationship, if any, between the President's so-called eight-man board and the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon that there is no relationship between that board and the Congress; that the board has had its lips sealed; that it is supposed to report at least once every six months; and that the report is to be made to the President only. What that means in effect is a further arrogation of power on the part of the Executive and a diminution to that extent of the equality between the executive and the legislative.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield for a question or two, or does he prefer to complete his remarks before yielding?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am honored to be a cosponsor with the Senator from Montana, of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, and I am glad he is discussing it today, because it seems to me that once again it is important that the American people—who, after all, in the last analysis, shall we say, "own" American foreign policy—should be apprised of the fact that there is a Government agency known as the CIA which works and functions in complete secrecy, and over which the Congress really has but little authority or jurisdiction except by way of the purse strings. In my view it is very dangerous to permit such an arrangement to continue, and I think Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 2 is essential from the standpoint of maintaining a people's check on American foreign policy, to the extent that the CIA is involved in American foreign policy.

With that statement, I should like to ask a few questions. Does the Senator agree with me that since the CIA organization functions in any country in any part of the world where it may operate with the secrecy that surrounds it, so far as its relationship to the Congress is concerned, it is bound to create the impression upon the leaders of the foreign countries in which it operates that its activities represent the official foreign policy of the United States?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that that is a fairly sound assumption. The officials of the CIA could be considered as agents of American foreign policy, and perhaps they are so considered in some countries; but I could not, on the basis of what I know about the CIA, either prove or disprove the Senator's statement, because there is only limited congressional contact with the agency.

Mr. MORSE. That is so, for the simple reason that Congress, along with the American people, is kept in ignorance about the operation of the CIA. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I have one further question. Has the Senator from Montana, as a colleague of mine on the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, ever received any correspondence or information or complaints in regard to the activities of CIA in foreign nations which indicate criticism of American foreign policy abroad?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I must say to the Senator that I have not.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to inform the Senator that I have received a series of communications in regard to alleged activities of the CIA which have caused me concern, and make me all the more enthusiastic in support of the Senator's resolution. I think it is highly desirable that we have, by congressional action, the authority which I think this resolution would give us to require this administration, through its CIA, to keep Congress, through the special committee which the Senator proposes to set up, informed as to exactly what it is doing in other countries by way of action that

is bound to have some effect on American foreign policy and our standing in those nations.

This all goes back to what as the Senator knows, is a deep conviction of mine. I abhor government by secrecy. I cannot reconcile it with democratic processes. In the Senate of the United States I do not propose by my vote to endorse the action of any administration no matter what the party, that keeps the American people so much in the dark as the American people are being kept in the dark by the present administration in the whole field of foreign policy. As the Senator knows, I do not agree that there can be justification for keeping from the American people by so-called executive committee meetings in the Senate a good deal of information. But I particularly abhor the operation of government by secrecy in such a way that it threatens the liberties of the American people. Whenever there is government by secrecy, the freedom and liberties of the American people are endangered. A mistake by the CIA in some tinderbox area of the world might result in the loss of the lives of millions of our fellow citizens because no opportunity was afforded in advance to place a check on mistaken policies on the part of the CIA or other agencies of our Government.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his pertinent observations.

Mr. President, the announcement of this new board was released 2 days after the time when the hearing on this bill was set by the Rules Committee. I do not think that was a deliberate attempt to head off the establishment of a congressional watchdog committee on the intelligence agency; I am sure that was only a matter of coincidence. But it does emphasize one thing: it extends and strengthens the executive control over the CIA.

I do not object to the formation of this new Commission, nor do I question the need by the Central Intelligence Agency and all other intelligence agencies in the Government for this kind of supervision. What I am concerned with, however, is the CIA's position of responsibility to none but the National Security Council. I believe this should be changed. The newly appointed board members will have neither power nor control over the CIA; and it appears to me that it is questionable how much this group will be permitted to learn under the agency's broad charter.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Concerning the responsibility of the CIA only to the National Security Council, if a change in that situation were to be made, would not a change of law be required, inasmuch as the law Congress passed in 1947, as I recall, requires the CIA to be responsible only to the National Security Council and to the President?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct. However, instead of changing the law, I think we should establish a joint watchdog com-

mittee composed of Members of the House and Members of the Senate. In that way we could provide safeguards in connection with the operation of the CIA, and we could also deal with questions which Members of Congress might have in their minds.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield further to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Of course, the Senator from Montana will agree with me that the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee now have subcommittees with members assigned to follow the activities of the CIA. Is not that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As a member of both those committees, I consider I have been informed of the activities of the CIA to the extent that I believe it is wise for me to be informed. As regards further information, let me say that, so far as I know, nothing has been concealed from us.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. Has the Senator from Massachusetts ever informed the Foreign Relations Committee of the information he gained in regard to the CIA?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have never been asked by the Foreign Relations Committee for any such information. We have discussed such matters rather briefly in the Armed Services Committee, in executive session, as I recall, and also, of course, in the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MORSE. That is just my point. After all, both the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee have great responsibilities in regard to foreign policy. The Foreign Relations Committee has no such liaison officer of which I know in respect to CIA, and I think it is very important that there be established the joint committee the Senator from Montana is proposing, with the very definite understanding that the Joint Committee will keep the Foreign Relations Committee, the Armed Services Committee, the Appropriations Committee, and the Senate as a whole informed. Certainly, under the advice and consent clause of the Constitution, it is important that we keep ourselves informed regarding what is occurring in connection with American foreign policy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one member of the committee, I reply that to the extent I can do so under security regulations and in accordance with my own knowledge, of course, I shall be very glad to inform the Senator from Oregon or any other Senator, insofar as it is proper for me to do so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I know the Senator from Massachusetts speaks from his heart, but I wonder whether the question I shall ask now

should be asked in public; if not, let the Senator from Massachusetts please refrain from answering it: How many times does the CIA request a meeting with the particular subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee and the Armed Services Committee, and how many times does the Senator from Massachusetts request the CIA to brief him in regard to existing affairs?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe the correct answer is that at least twice a year that happens in the Armed Services Committee, and at least once a year it happens in the Appropriations Committee. I speak from my knowledge of the situation during the last year or so; I do not attempt to refer to previous periods. Certainly the present administrator and the former administrator, Gen. Bedell Smith, stated that they were ready at all times to answer any questions we might wish to ask them. The difficulty in connection with asking questions and obtaining information is that we might obtain information which I personally would rather not have, unless it was essential for me as a Member of Congress to have it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I think the Senator's answer tells the whole story, for he has informed us that a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee has met only twice a year with members of the CIA, and that a subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee has met only once a year with members of the CIA. Of course, it is very likely that the meetings in connection with the Appropriations Committee occurred only at a time when the CIA was making requests for appropriations. That information from the Senator from Massachusetts does not indicate to me that there is sufficiently close contact between the congressional committees and the CIA, as such.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In reply, let me state—and I should like to discuss this point more fully when I present my own views on this subject—that it is not a question of reluctance on the part of the CIA officials to speak to us. Instead, it is a question of our reluctance, if you will, to seek information and knowledge on subjects which I personally, as a Member of Congress and as a citizen, would rather not have, unless I believed it to be my responsibility to have it because it might involve the lives of American citizens.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I see. The Senator is to be commended.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that no one has greater respect for the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] than do I, and what I say now goes only to the point of view he has expressed, and not to the Senator from Massachusetts himself. But it is the very point of view of the Senator from Massachusetts which I protest, because the very procedure for checking the CIA the Senator from Massachusetts has outlined is at best a voluntary one, and is not based upon the establishment by resolu-

tion of a mandatory jurisdiction of the Congress in relation to the CIA. That is what is necessary. But it does not exist under the present very loose and voluntary relationship existing between the CIA and the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee. What we must do is to write in black and white provisions which will give mandatory jurisdictional power to the Congress in relationship to the CIA.

The second point I wish to mention in connection with a comment made by the Senator from Massachusetts—whom I highly respect, but who has laid down a premise with which I am in total disagreement—is in relation to the argument that some information in this field should be kept from the Members of Congress who serve on the appropriate committees, and that such Members of Congress should not have knowledge of those matters.

Mr. President, let us consider the personnel of the CIA. Who are the supermen of the CIA? They are not elected officials of the Government. Instead, they are appointees of the executive branch of the Government. But the responsibility as the elected representatives of a free people happens to be ours, under the advice and consent clause of the Constitution, to protect the people, by serving as a check against the administration—and I care not whether it is a Republican or a Democratic administration. What is happening today, in connection with the trend toward government by secrecy in America, is that Congress has been standing by and has not been insisting upon exercising its power to check the executive branch of the Government in many fields including foreign policy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon is entirely correct. The trend to which he has referred began during the Roosevelt administration, if not before, and continued during the Truman administration and down into the present administration. I refer to the trend toward reposing more and more power in the hands of the executive branch of the Government, and less and less power in the hands of the Congress. The Senate must wake up and do something about this matter, because, unless we do so, as time passes the Congress will become less of an equal branch under our constitutional system, and more power will rest in the hands of the Executive. The policy of increased executive power is nonpartisan. The same thing happened under Democratic administrations as is happening under a Republican administration.

Mr. MORSE. For years I sat over on the other side of the aisle and made the same protests under Democratic administrations that I am making today under a Republican administration.

This policy of too much secrecy has been characteristic of administrations of all parties in the executive branch. What we must do is to face up, before it is too late, to the fact that there is an increasing concentration of arbitrary power in the executive branch of the Government. This process has been going on for the past quarter of a century.

We must stop it. The CIA issue affords a good example of what I am protesting.

I do not know of a single secret of Government which ought to be vested in the hands and minds of some appointees of the executive branch of Government in the CIA, to the exclusion of the elected representatives of the people. Who are these CIA employees? Many of them are very young, and, from the standpoint of experience, very immature men. Does anyone suggest that it is safe for democracy to vest in them crucial information, and to say that because we are Members of Congress on the Foreign Relations or Armed Services Committee, we should not have or should not want such information? I say that we must insist on getting it, if we are to keep faith with the oath we took when we entered this body, and are properly to discharge our duties and responsibilities as elected representatives of a free people.

Today we are talking about an abstraction in respect to a principle of Government, but the Senator from Montana is to be complimented and commended for raising the issue. He has raised an issue of government under our constitutional system which has been too long lost sight of by too many people in this country.

What is happening now in the United States is similar to what has happened in the history of other free nations. They flowered in freedom for a long time, and then gradually a small clique of government officials in the executive branch started taking over their rights, freedoms, and liberties. The people woke up too late to discover that they had lost their freedoms, rights, and liberties. It can happen in America, if we do not stand on guard in relation to the principle of checks and balances under the Constitution.

I commend the Senator from Montana. Through this resolution I think he has placed his finger on a very important duty of Members of Congress. We ought to insist that the power which has been vested in the CIA be subjected to an occasional check, as provided by his resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Oregon is absolutely correct. Under the Roosevelt administration so-called executive agreements were agreed to between this country and Saudi Arabia, Yemen, and Nepal. Those executive agreements should have come before the Senate, under the advice-and-consent clause of the Constitution, because they were in reality treaties of friendship and commerce.

Under the Truman administration, Congress appropriated sufficient funds to provide for a 70-group Air Force. President Truman impounded the money and allowed only a 48-group Air Force to come into being.

Under this administration, last year Congress appropriated \$40 million to maintain the Marine Corps at its then present strength. What happened? Secretary of Defense Wilson said he would not use the money. He did use a part of it. A part of the cut went into effect. I note from the document asking additional appropriations for the fiscal

year 1956, page 8, that it develops that under the Department of Defense, military functions, the Office of the Secretary of Defense used \$769,000—to be derived from where? From transfer from the appropriation "Military personnel, Marine Corps."

The Office of Public Affairs in the Department of Defense used \$27,500, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Military personnel, Marine Corps."

For Interservice Activities, Court of Military Appeals, \$41,400 was used, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Military personnel, Marine Corps."

For the Department of the Navy, servicewide supply and finance, \$7,400,000 was used, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Military personnel, Marine Corps."

For servicewide operations in the Department of the Navy, \$2,180,000 was used, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Military personnel, Marine Corps."

All this was after the Congress unanimously restored \$40 million to maintain the Marine Corps at its then present strength, 223,000 men. What happened to those funds? What happened to the mandate laid down by Congress, which is supposed to control the Armed Forces of the United States, and to provide for them? What happened during the Truman administration when Congress appropriated for a 70-group Air Force? What happened during the Roosevelt administration when, in the field of foreign policy, executive agreements were made which were in reality treaties of commerce and friendship?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. First, with respect to the executive agreements to which the Senator has referred, let me say that I believe they should have been made in the form of treaties, and should have been brought to the attention of the Senate.

So far as the Marine Corps appropriation is concerned, that question is now before the Committee on Appropriations. I agree with the Senator that if the money was not used for the Marine Corps, if the total strength of the Marine Corps provided for by the Congress was not maintained, and was not necessary, in the opinion of the Department, that money should have gone back to the Treasury, and, if money for other purposes was needed, new appropriations should have been requested. There should have been no transfers. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to hear it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not approve of the method by which the funds were handled. The question as to whether the strength of the Marine Corps provided for by Congress was necessary is another issue; but certainly the money should not have been transferred.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As the Senator knows far better than I, a portion of the Marine Corps cut was restored.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But not to the point mandated by the Congress of the United States. The Senator from Massachusetts also voted last year for the \$40 million appropriation to maintain the Marine Corps at its then present strength. The money is being used for other purposes, which in my judgment is contrary to the intent and wish of the Congress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If my memory is correct as to the figures—and I am not sure it is—the number of marines last year was 215,000. The idea was to reduce the number to 195,000, in round figures. Congress directed that the strength be kept at 215,000. I believe that the present figure is 201,000, and that it will be 205,000 at the end of the present fiscal year. I am not quite certain as to the accuracy of those figures, but the present strength is more than 200,000.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think the Senator is approximately correct; but it is still to be noted that the wishes of the Congress were ignored by Mr. Wilson, who is an agent of the President, and the money was used as he saw fit, and not as Congress intended.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to join the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in complimenting the Senator from Montana for bringing this subject to the attention of the Senate.

I believe that the entire policy of secrecy in this connection is a cancer in the operation of our Government.

Only a short time ago we had the spectacle of Sherman Adams, Assistant to the President, telephoning to the Securities and Exchange Commission and holding up for 3 or 4 days a hearing in connection with the Dixon-Yates matter. When we asked why an Assistant to the President should call up an agency of Government and delay a hearing for 3 or 4 days, while in the House an appropriation of \$6,500,000 was being considered, we received a letter from the assistant secretary to the effect that this subject was secret.

When the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], as chairman of the subcommittee, joined with other members of the subcommittee in a letter requesting the Assistant to the President, Sherman Adams, to come before us and tell us the reason for such procedures, we received a very brief letter of 3 or 4 lines in reply.

I fully agree with the Senator from Oregon that the policy of secrecy is resulting in keeping from the Congress and the people matters with which the Congress ought to be thoroughly familiar. We are called upon to enact laws dealing with those subjects, and we are dealing with them, as the Senator from Massachusetts stated a few moments ago, in such a manner that members of the Committee on Armed Services meet only twice a year with representatives of the CIA, and members of the Committee on Appropriations meet with them only once a year, when they need more money. I believe the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which the distinguished Senator

from Oregon and the distinguished Senator from Montana and I are members, can testify to the fact that we see those gentlemen, members of the CIA, on very, very rare occasions, and then only when we practically invite them to attend.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator may well be correct. As a matter of fact, I do not recall ever seeing them before the Committee on Foreign Relations, although I may be mistaken about that.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more? I shall not interrupt him again after this comment if it can be avoided.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to associate myself with the observations of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and I am very glad, indeed, that the Senator from Montana has mentioned the executive agreements which have been made with some Middle East countries, especially Saudi Arabia.

He has referred to agreements about which we were not apprised at the time they were made. I do not believe it can be questioned that in regard to a good many of the agreements which are entered into the CIA has, so to speak, a background part to play, and does play; and it supplies what it believes to be information which ought to be influential in reaching executive decisions. That is why I believe it very important that the Committee on Foreign Relations be kept advised right up to the minute in regard to the findings of the CIA and the recommendations of the CIA as they may affect American foreign policy.

Let us take, for example, the executive agreement to which the Senator from Montana has referred. Now, belatedly, we are beginning to get information, for example, pointing out that in Saudi Arabia human-slavery traffic is rampant in the year 1956. Before the week is over I intend to discuss on the floor of the Senate human-slavery traffic in Saudi Arabia.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, the argument is made that we ought to ship military supplies to Saudi Arabia. The argument is made that in order to combat communism we ought to keep an airbase in Saudi Arabia.

Mr. President, I seriously question the whole program of America in Saudi Arabia, so long as evidence can be brought forth that the nation with whom we have the agreements is engaged in human slavery in this year of 1956.

We cannot reconcile that fact with the high moral principles for which we as a nation profess to stand in American foreign policy.

The reason I am pleading for full disclosure to the American people of American foreign policy is that if such disclosure is not made we get into the kind of situation the Senator from Montana has mentioned with regard to so-called executive agreements. That happens whenever we in the Congress do not have all the facts presented to us.

I sat on the Committee on Armed Services for 8 years. What did the brass do? They came before the committee and said, "This is our recommendation."

However, because of the top secrecy involved, we do not want to go into the information and the facts on which the recommendation is based."

What did we do? We used to sit there and say, "Well, we will take you at your word."

In my judgment, we should not do that. In my judgment, in a democracy, the elected representatives of the people are entitled to whatever facts anyone who has brass on his shoulders may have in his head. I for one think we ought to stop the tendency to let the military, the CIA, and a few officials of the State Department determine foreign policy for the American people, without any check on the process by their elected representatives in the Legislative Halls of the Government.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator that what frightens me about the whole matter is the fact that the Senate, particularly, has been willing to give up its share of its responsibility in the Government during the past 15 or 20 years, at least. It is a bad trend. I do not believe it is the President who is arrogating unto himself this added authority. I assume it is in the executive departments and in the praetorian guard in the White House where the authority is being used, to the detriment of the elected representatives of the people in both the House and in the Senate, and against the course laid down under the Constitution of the United States.

It is a very serious constitutional question. I deeply regret that I am not a constitutional lawyer, because I believe there is quite a field for discussion of this subject. I only hope that the Senate will recognize the fact and will take some action to restore the equality which should exist between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield once more? Then, like the Senator from Oregon, I will not interrupt him again. That is, I hope I will not interrupt him again, but I cannot promise that I will not.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am sure the Senator will agree with me that the CIA is not a policymaking body but that the policymaking body is the State Department which is an executive agency of the President in the initiation and determination of the foreign policy of the United States. In the same way, under the President, the Defense Department is the initiating body with regard to our national security. I am sure the Senator will agree with me on those primary facts.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; except that in the field of foreign policy we do have the advice and consent clause in the Constitution. That clause can be stretched a long, long way. That is what has been happening in recent years, with the result that the Senate has exercised less and less influence in foreign affairs, and with the further result that the executive department has taken un-

der its control more and more of that field.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The point I wished to make especially in the present discussion is that the CIA is not a policymaking body of the executive branch of the Government, and that the policymaking body is the State Department. The CIA is one of the agencies which the State Department uses in determining what the foreign policy of the Government shall be.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would be inclined to take the Senator's word for that. However, I do not know whether the CIA has any part in making policy. The Senator is correct in saying that it is the function of the State Department under the President of the United States to act in that field.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The present Administrator of CIA does his utmost to maintain that principle within his agency. In other words, he does not alone determine policy, but carries out the orders which are given to him by the policymaking body.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree with the Senator. In my remarks about the CIA I wish it to be clearly understood that I have nothing but the highest regard for Mr. Allen Dulles, the Director of CIA, and for the type of administration which he is carrying on. What I am talking about is the CIA as an executive agency and its relations to Congress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I assume that the Administrator of CIA—the present one or any other Administrator, past or present—would come before the Committee on Foreign Relations and discuss with it any subject he could properly discuss within his field, if the committee asked him to appear before it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, I know and believe he would be glad to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Of course the problem of security comes up, both in public and in executive sessions.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am always interested in the meaning that is given to words. Of course, when we argue that CIA is not a policymaking body because under the administrative setup it is not charged with making policy, it does not follow that it does not make policy. Let us take a look at Government operations and what happens when we give an assignment to an agency such as CIA.

It proceeds to gather information and to make investigations and studies. On the basis of such studies and investigations and what it discloses to the executive arm of the Government, and what it does not disclose, someone in the Government must then make a determination. The tendency is usually to follow the recommendation of the agency that was asked to do the job of investigating.

One of the reasons why I believe the pending concurrent resolution should be adopted is that we should find out to what extent in fact—not in theory, but in fact—CIA is forming policy. I will tell the Senate my suspicion. My suspicion is that it determines a great deal of

policy. I happen to believe we have the duty of finding out whether my suspicion—and I am not the only one who has such a suspicion—is warranted or not. I think we must take it for granted that when we give broad powers to the CIA, which it has been exercising, it has great influence in determining foreign policy. I urge that a check be placed upon it. We ought to know to what extent its recommendations are being generally followed.

I agree with the Senator with respect to Allen Dulles, but I am not in favor of giving him unchecked power. I want to know to what extent the recommendations and the policies made by CIA under Allen Dulles become the policies of John Foster Dulles, his brother, the Secretary of State. I believe we need checks on families as well as checks on men who do not belong to the same families.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not only would that question be interesting, but I am sure the answer to it would also be interesting.

Mr. President, so long as the subject of the power of the executive vis-a-vis the legislative has been brought up, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks an excerpt from a communication from the President of the United States to the 84th Congress, 2d session, Document 341, at the top of page 8, under the heading "Department of Defense—Military Functions," be incorporated in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY FUNCTIONS

Office of the Secretary of Defense: "Salaries and expenses," \$769,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Military personnel, Marine Corps";

"Office of Public Affairs," \$27,500, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Military personnel, Marine Corps";

Interservice activities: "Court of Military Appeals," \$41,400, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Military personnel, Marine Corps";

Department of the Navy: "Service-wide supply and finance," \$7,400,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Military personnel, Marine Corps";

"Service-wide operations," \$2,180,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Military personnel, Marine Corps."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have made a part of the RECORD at this point in my remarks a copy of a speech which I made 2 years ago relative to 3 executive agreements under the Roosevelt administration which should have come before the Senate.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

There is a real issue, and it has troubled me deeply, as I am sure it has troubled other Senators. It is to be found in the power of the executive branch in the field of foreign policy.

The Constitution specifically provides the President with certain unique powers to conduct our foreign relations, just as the other branches of Government have unique powers in other matters. I do not question those

powers which accrue to him as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

But in one aspect of our foreign relations, the treaty-making power, he does not have unique, but rather concurrent, power shared with the Senate. Treaties are to be made by the President only with the advice and consent of the Senate. The most vital matters involving the relationships of this country with others are or should be conducted within this realm of concurrent power.

But it is precisely in this realm that an extra-constitutional device, the executive agreement, now threatens the fine balance of power which has been maintained under our system of government for a century and a half.

It will be argued, as it has been, that executive agreements are used almost exclusively in pursuance of authority delegated by Congress or to supplement certain valid undertakings growing out of the unique powers of the President. That is true, and I think the device, so used, is necessary and useful and harmless to the principle of balance of powers.

But it is not in the mass of executive agreements that the issue is to be found. It is, rather, in the few, in the very few. For it is in the few, the very few, that this extra-constitutional device can be used to stretch the unique powers of the executive. It is in the few that there lies the danger of usurpation, destruction of the constitutional balance, and in the last analysis, the threat of Executive tyranny.

This is no imaginary fear which haunts me and other members of the Senate. Executive agreements have been used to stretch the powers of the Presidency and unless safeguards are established there is no reason to believe that they will not continue to be so used. If the Senate will bear with me for a few moments longer, I will undertake to prove by specific example how this extra-constitutional device can undermine the power of the Senate in foreign relations. I will endeavor to show how this device can and has been used to erode that power and transfer it painlessly, almost imperceptibly, from this body to the executive branch.

For decades, treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation have been made with other countries by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. As the Senators know, these are basic treaties which establish the framework of our relations with other countries. The Senate has traditionally given advice and consent to such treaties. It still does so, for the most part.

In 1933, however, the Department of State negotiated an agreement of friendship and commerce with Saudi Arabia. As far as I can determine, this was the first time an executive agreement, rather than a treaty, was used for this purpose. To be sure, the agreement with Saudi Arabia was labeled provisional in nature and was to remain in effect, I quote: "until the entry in force of a definitive treaty of commerce and navigation." Even though it was temporary, however, the State Department must have known that this executive agreement was treading on dangerous constitutional ground for it added the following clause, I quote "Should the Government of the United States of America be prevented by future action of its Legislature from carrying out the terms of these stipulations the obligations thereof shall thereupon lapse."

This executive agreement was never replaced by a definitive treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation. Though the Senate has never given consent to ratification, it stands in equal force with genuine treaties dealing with the same subject matter, to which the Senate has given approval.

This agreement, Mr. President, established a precedent. Note now how the precedent is reinforced. Thirteen years later, in 1946, the

State Department negotiated a similar agreement with the Kingdom of Yemen. The terms of the two agreements were practically identical except for two omissions. The agreement with Yemen no longer carried the phrase indicating that it was to remain in effect only, I quote: "until the entry in force of a definitive treaty of commerce and navigation." Also omitted was the phrase, I quote: "Should the Government of the United States of America be prevented by future action of its Legislature from carrying out the terms of these stipulations the obligations thereof shall thereupon lapse."

In short, the State Department appears, in 13 years, to have reached the conclusion that the power to make treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation had become, at least in some cases, a unique power of the executive branch, that the consent of the Senate was no longer necessary, at least in some of these agreements.

One year later, in 1947, a third agreement of friendship, commerce, and navigation was negotiated with the Kingdom of Nepal. In printing the text of this agreement in its Bulletin, the State Department apparently still had a twinge of nervousness about the procedure it was following. It was constrained to point to two precedents. What were the precedents? The agreements with Yemen and Saudi Arabia.

Yemen, Saudi Arabia, and Nepal. These are small, faraway lands. Few of us could locate them quickly on a map. Still fewer have any direct concern with what transpires in them. Yet, the agreements which have been negotiated with them constitute a series of precedents which is of vital importance to our constitutional division of powers. None of them has ever been replaced by a regular treaty, yet all of them cover subject matter which traditionally has been handled by treaty.

Twenty-one years have elapsed since the first of these three agreements was negotiated. Was the failure to replace the agreements by permanent treaty an oversight or a conscious expansion of the unique powers of the executive at the expense of the Senate? Is this example a straw man or a very real case of usurpation of power? Will the President now send these three agreements or their permanent replacements to the Senate for advice or consent or after years and decades is the need still for temporary agreements?

How is the Senate to deal with the disappearance of its prerogatives in this fashion?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that some illustrations of the use of Executive power in relation to the power of Congress, which I requested the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to compile for me, be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the illustrations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C.,

SOME ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE USE OF EXECUTIVE
POWER IN RELATION TO THE POWER OF
CONGRESS

The general nature of the alleged usurpation of the powers of Congress by Executive circumvention of legislative intent has been stated by Representative HOWARD W. SMITH.

Testifying before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress on March 28, 1945, Representative SMITH said:

"Under our Constitution legislation is supposed to be enacted by the Congress. I want to call your attention to what I assert to be a fact, that we now have not only legislation by the Congress, but we have

four other types of legislation. I will go into each one of them a little more fully We have legislation by sanctions; we have legislation by subsidies; we have legislation by Executive regulations, under authority of acts of Congress; and we have legislation by interpretation—interpretations that Congress never dreamed of when we enacted the law.

"I think that that is of very great moment. . . . I do not think the American people realize to what extent our system of government is being changed by these innovations. . . .

"I do not think Congress as a Congress realizes it. On the other hand, I think almost every individual Member of Congress realizes what is going on, and they talk about it and fuss about it, and they say something ought to be done about it, but as a rule Congress does not do anything about it.

"Now, much of this stuff is done in perfectly good faith. I am not here to say that any of it is not done in good faith. It is done under the spur of the emergency, but when we once break down the constitutional boundaries and begin to do things that there is not any authority under the Constitution or the law for, we get into a field that spreads and gets worse, like a spreading disease.

"Personally I am very much disturbed about it and I hope that we can do something to check it and bring us back within the limits of what we ought to do."

Absolute and unequivocal proof of executive circumvention of legislative intent in the interpretation or administration of laws passed by Congress is in most cases impossible to obtain. In some instances disputes arising under these circumstances have been settled by adjudication, but in most cases these conflicts have been characterized by charges and allegations which were sometimes answered and sometimes ignored. Interpretations of what a law means and how it should be administered may very well often require the exercise of subjective judgment. The charges of circumvention may be equally subjective. There may be no conclusive evidence that either party is acting in bad faith, or that the executive is deliberately flouting the law.

Certainly there are some instances where evasion or ignoring of the law was deliberate, but in these cases the President usually acted upon what might be argued to be mitigating circumstances or what he regarded as a more fundamental legal authority. For example, President Jackson felt that his reelection in 1832, after a thorough public discussion of his veto of the bill to recharter the National Bank, justified his withdrawal of public funds from the bank 3 years before its old charter was to expire. Although he acted legally through his Secretary of the Treasury, Jackson knew that he was acting contrary to congressional intent. "Indeed, Congress had already refused to pass a measure authorizing him specifically to do this. . . ."

In a case of historic importance, President Andrew Johnson fired Secretary of War Stanton in deliberate violation of the Tenure of Office Act, which had been passed over his veto, because he "was convinced that the act was unconstitutional and was consequently eager to get it in the courts for the purpose of a test."¹ Although Johnson was impeached primarily for this action and escaped conviction by only one vote, this law was repealed in 1887, and a very similar measure was declared unconstitutional in

¹ Binkley, Wilfred E. *The Powers of the President*, New York, Doubleday, Doran, 1937, pp. 76-77.

² Ibid, p. 149. See also Corwin, Edward S., *The President: Office and Powers*, New York, New York University Press, 1948, pp. 77-78.

1926 in *Myers v. United States* (272 U. S. 52).

The illustrations of alleged executive circumvention or flouting of legislative intent in the following pages of this report do not by any means comprise a definitive listing of examples. They are, rather, cases that could be compiled in the time available, and it is hoped that, taken together, they offer a fairly representative picture of cases of this type.

One other explanatory word is needed. No attempt has been made to present the other side, the answers to charges of executive disregard for legislative intent. Much background material has also been omitted. The political context surrounding each example is held to the absolute minimum.

President Theodore Roosevelt is known as a Chief Executive who believed in using the power of his office to the full. Two examples of his alleged circumvention of legislative intent are recorded here:

In two other instances, although his conduct ultimately received a judicial sanction, [T. R.] Roosevelt aroused the ire of his political opponents by employing the powers granted to him by these statutes to secure a result apparently not intended by these acts, and certainly not approved by Congress. Having failed to convince Congress of the urgency of preventing the acquisition by monopolies of public coal lands at ridiculously low prices, he undertook to remedy this situation by issuing a series of proclamations withdrawing these coal lands from public entry and setting them aside as parts of the national forest reserves. That a doubt existed as to the legality of these orders is attested by the refusal of his successor, Taft, to proceed further without an express sanction of Congress. Again, when an attempt was made to obstruct his efforts at conservation by attaching to an appropriation bill a rider exempting from withdrawal as reserves a large portion of public lands in the Northwest, Roosevelt, without assuming the responsibility of vetoing a financial measure, defeated this effort by setting aside all the timber lands in question before the bill was presented to him for signature.

President Woodrow Wilson was another of the so-called strong Presidents who believed in the vigorous use of all of the powers of his office, as the following excerpt shows:

Even Wilson, staunch advocate that he was of the observance of strictly legitimate procedures, was not averse, on the occasion of impending war, to execute a policy for which statutory authorization, previously solicited from Congress, had been refused. In asking Congress to empower him to arm merchant vessels, Wilson had spoken as follows:

"No doubt I already possess that authority without special warrant of law by the plain implication of my constitutional duties and powers, but I prefer to act not upon implication. I wish to feel that the authority and power of Congress are behind me."

Notwithstanding the defeat of an authorizing statute by the action of 11 willful men, Wilson proceeded to arm merchant vessels in reliance not only upon his constitutional powers but upon the support derived from an obsolete statute of 1819. Where an executive relies on a novel interpretation of an existing statute, which was designed at the date of its adoption to serve a wholly unrelated purpose, it would seem that by an act of repeal, Congress could deprive the executive of the color of author-

ity for his action. Whether the repeal of the law could, of itself, halt the President is probably dependent upon whether his action, through his subordinates, could be made the subject of litigation.

The following excerpt is taken from the annual message of President Warren G. Harding delivered to the Congress on December 6, 1921:

"The previous Congress, deeply concerned in behalf of our merchant marine, in 1920 enacted the existing shipping law, designed for the upbuilding of the American merchant marine. Among other things provided to encourage our shipping on the world's seas, the executive was directed to give notice of the termination of all existing commercial treaties in order to admit of reduced duties on imports carried in American bottoms. During the life of the act no executive has complied with this order of the Congress. When the present administration came into responsibility it began an early inquiry into the failure to execute the expressed purpose of the Jones Act. Only one conclusion has been possible. Frankly, Members of the House and Senate, eager as I am to join you in the making of an American merchant marine commensurate with our commerce, the denouncement of our commercial treaties would involve us in a chaos of trade relationships and add indescribably to the confusion of the already disordered commercial world. Our power to do so is not disputed, but power and ships, without comity of relationship, will not give us the expanded trade which is inseparably linked with a great merchant marine. Moreover, the applied reduction of duty, for which the treaty denunciations were necessary, encouraged only the carrying of dutiable imports to our shores, while the tonnage which unfurls the flag on the seas is both free and dutiable, and the cargoes which make a nation eminent in trade are outgoing, rather than incoming.

"It is not my thought to lay the problem before you in detail today. It is desired only to say to you that the executive branch of the Government, uninfluenced by the protest of any nation, for none has been made, is well convinced that your proposal, highly intended and heartily supported here, is so fraught with difficulties and so marked by tendencies to discourage trade expansion, that I invite your tolerance of noncompliance for only a few weeks until a plan may be presented which contemplates no greater draft upon the Public Treasury, and which, though yet too crude to offer it today, gives such promise of expanding our merchant marine, that it will argue its own approval."

One outstanding authority on the presidency declares that Franklin D. Roosevelt, in a message of September 7, 1942, peremptorily demanded that Congress repeal a certain provision of the Emergency Price Control Act or that he, the President, would treat this provision as repealed. After quoting a passage from the Roosevelt message, Edward S. Corwin goes on to say:

"In a word, the President said to Congress: 'Unless you repeal a certain statutory provision forthwith, I shall nevertheless treat it as repealed.' On what grounds did Mr. Roosevelt rest his case for power of so transcendent a nature? Although he made a vague gesture toward congressional acts, it is obvious that his principal reliance was, and could only have been, on his powers under the Constitution—that is to say, his conception of these. Presidents have before this in a few instances announced that they did not consider themselves constitutionally obligated by something which Congress had enacted but which, as they contended, trenching on presidential prerogatives. This, for example, was Johnson's position in 1867. But the position advanced by Mr. Roosevelt

... goes beyond this, claiming as it does for the President the power and right to disregard a statutory provision which he did not venture to deny, and indeed could not possibly have denied, which Congress had complete constitutional authority to enact, and which, therefore, he was obligated by express words of the Constitution to take care should be faithfully executed."

Speaking of the administration of the Internal Security Act, former Senator Herbert R. O'Connor, of Maryland, said:

"There is strong evidence that some officials of this Government are engaged in a studied and deliberate effort to avoid compliance with certain basic provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950 which are designed to protect this country against infiltration by Communist agents.

"Notwithstanding these provisions of the Internal Security Act which provide for the exclusion and deportation of aliens whose presence in this country endangers the public security, virtually nothing was being done by the executive department to carry those provisions into effect."

"In the course of the last few days we held an executive session with the officials of the Department of State on this matter including the Chief of the Division of International Administration and the administrative attorney of the Division. So far as I can comprehend their attitude it is this, that the security of the United States should be weighed in the balance against a policy of facilitating our international relations with other nations. I assert that this is not only a direct violation of the Internal Security Act, which these officials are sworn to uphold and which is designed to protect this country, but is a course leading to the practical annulment of the statutory provisions passed by the Congress to protect our internal security.

"So long as certain officials of this Government refuse to heed the warnings of our intelligence agencies and deliberately ignore provisions of the Internal Security Act, we shall have an open door for the infiltration of spies and saboteurs."

Both President Truman and President Eisenhower have been subjected to congressional criticism for impounding funds which have been appropriated by Congress for specific purposes. In 1949 Congress appropriated money for 58 air groups. A Truman order of October 29 specified that funds would be spent for only the 48 air groups he had recommended. This policy was examined by the House Subcommittee on the Department of Defense Appropriations in January 1950. Members of the subcommittee regarded the action as an invasion of congressional authority. Representative SIKES declared: "I would consider that there is a prohibition in the law against the things which now are being done. The Congress under the Constitution decides how much money is to be expended. . . . Anything done contrary to this is in my opinion contrary to the basic law of the land."

Last Summer President Eisenhower was accused by several Senators of acting, or threatening to act, with regard to already appropriated funds, in a manner that was contrary to the wishes and intentions of Congress. In the public works appropriation bill Congress inserted provisions for funds for some projects that did not appear

* Small, Norman J., *Some Presidential Interpretations of the Presidency*, Baltimore, the Johns Hopkins Press, 1932, pp. 148-149.

† *Memorandum on the Powers of Congress, Short of Impeachment, To Control a President in Matters of the Faithful Execution of Congressional Legislation*, Legislative Reference Service Report, October 20, 1942.

‡ Corwin, Edward S., op. cit., pp. 304-305.

* CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 10, pages 13323-13324.

† *Executive-Legislative Relations: Examples of Real or Alleged Overstepping, 1920-51*, Legislative Reference Service Report, May 28, 1951.

‡ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 8, pages 10672-10679.

in the President's budget. "According to the newspaper stories," said Senator MOORE, "the President implied such unbudgeted projects will not be initiated even though the Congress has specifically appropriated the funds until detailed engineering plans have been completed. * * * It will be a sad day for government by law if a President is allowed to thwart the will of Congress as President Eisenhower apparently intimated he might do."

With reference to an aspect of the Dixon-Yates controversy, Senator O'MAHONEY said: "If it shall continue to be true that the President and the Bureau of the Budget can defy the acts of Congress in making appropriations and can say, notwithstanding the appropriations, that the works will not be built because the executive department does not approve of them, although the President has signed the bill, it is useless to talk about saving free government." Referring to the congressional appropriation affecting the Marine Corps, Senator MANSFIELD declared: "Why should Secretary [of Defense] Wilson thwart the will of the Congress by saying he had impounded the \$46 million authorized by the Congress to keep the marines at their present strength? * * * This is something the executive branch is doing regardless of the action taken by Congress." On another subject, Senator NEUBERGER said: "The President announces to the world, in a press statement, that, even though the Congress has provided for the Cougar Dam, he evidently does not intend to proceed with the spending of the money for it, although the appropriation has been provided by the Congress."

A question of executive as against legislative authority arose last July when President Eisenhower signed the Defense Department appropriation bill. Section 638 of this measure gave to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House a virtual veto power over certain proposed cutbacks in some of the business enterprises in the Defense Department. The President signed the bill because the Department had to have the money, but he declared in his message of July 13 that section 638 "constitutes an unconstitutional invasion of the province of the Executive. * * * Such section will be regarded as invalid * * * unless otherwise determined by a court of competent jurisdiction."

According to the Washington Star of July 15, Representative SIXES was completely shocked at the President's attitude. "Seldom have I heard such complete and utter disregard for the rights and privileges of Congress or of the constitutional processes of law." He said the President would "in this way seek to place himself above the law and to set aside a section of law that he or someone who speaks for him does not like. This is veto by paragraph, and veto by paragraph is not legal. This is usurpation of the powers of the Congress." House Majority Leader MCCORMACK said: "I had the idea that the Civil War settled the question of nullification in this country, but this is a nullification of an act of Congress."

The following material consists entirely of examples of executive agreements and other international agreements arrived at through executive action. The first 2 excerpts discuss the subject in general terms; the next 4 consist of more specific illustrations:

The first of the general excerpts follows:⁹

"Generally speaking, the interwar period was characterized by the wide use of executive agreements to effect international understandings on matters that seem quite as important as those dignified by the use of the treaty-making process. Approval by two-thirds of the Senate was not required to

terminate the First World War, to join the International Labor Organization, to acquire Atlantic naval bases in British territory in return for overage destroyers, to accept the Atlantic Charter, nor to enter into lend-lease agreements."

The second of the general excerpts states:¹⁰

"The United States annexed Texas and Hawaii, ended the First World War, joined the International Labor Organization, the Universal Postal Union and the Pan American Union, settled over \$10 billion worth of post-World War I debts, acquired Atlantic naval bases in British territory during World War II, acquired all financial claims of the Soviet Union in the United States, joined the United Nations pledging itself not to make separate peace in World War II and to accept the Atlantic Charter, submitted over a score of cases to international arbitration, and modified the tariff in numerous reciprocal trade agreements by means other than the treaty-making process."

The more specific illustrations are:

"1. INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION"¹¹

"Membership of the United States of America, by proclamation by the President of the United States, September 10, 1934

"Whereas by a joint resolution of the Congress of the United States of America, approved June 19, 1934, the President was authorized to accept membership for the Government of the United States of America in the International Labor Organization, provided that in accepting such membership the President should assume on behalf of the United States of America no obligation under the covenant of the League of Nations. * * *

"2. ACQUISITION OF ATLANTIC NAVAL BASES"¹²

"Naval and air bases

"United Kingdom

"Arrangement providing for lease to the United States of naval and air bases in Antigua, Bahamas, Bermuda, British Guiana, Jamaica, Newfoundland, St. Lucia, and Trinidad and for transfer to the United Kingdom of 50 United States Navy destroyers.

"Effectuated by exchange of notes signed at Washington September 2, 1940.

"Duration: Not stated; leases to run for 99 years.

"Text: (54 Stat. 2405; E. A. S. 181; 203 L. N. T. S. 201). Opinion of the Attorney General.

"Advising that the proposed arrangement might be concluded as an executive agreement and that there was Presidential power to transfer title and possession of the overage destroyers (39 Op. Att. Gen., 484).

"3. ATLANTIC CHARTER"¹³

"On August 14, 1941, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, representing the United States and Great Britain, issued a joint declaration of peace aims. * * *

"4. PAN AMERICAN UNION"¹⁴

"The Pan American Union was set up and continues to exist by virtue of a series of resolutions to which the President's plenipotentiaries, as members of international conferences of the American states, gave his and their consent, but in regard to which

⁹ McDougal, Myres S. and Asher Lans. *Treaties and Congressional-Executive or Presidential Agreements: Interchangeable Instruments of National Policy*. Yale Law Journal, Vol. 54, no. 2, March 1945. P. 238.

¹⁰ U. S. Congress, 75th Cong., 3d sess., Senate Doc. 134, p. 5531.

¹¹ U. S. Congress, 76th Cong., 3d sess., House Doc. 943.

¹² Langer, William L., comp. and ed., *An Encyclopedia of World History*, Boston, Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1952, p. 1137.

¹³ McClure, Wallace M., *International Executive Agreements*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1941, p. 12.

Congress appears to have exercised no influence other than its power—common to both treaty- and agreement-made unions—to grant or to withhold appropriations for the payment of the recurrent dues."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will this new commission be able to make available to the public and to Congress anything they learn about CIA doing the wrong things or not doing enough of the right things? This commission is responsible to the executive department alone, and lacks the legal authority a congressional inquiry enjoys. An Executive order could conceal any report or recommendation the Board might make on the grounds that revealing such information might injure the country. The Congress would still remain in the dark.

It is true that intelligence services of other major countries operate without direct control of the legislatures. This is understandable in a totalitarian government, such as the Soviet Union. It is even understandable in a parliamentary democracy, such as Great Britain, where the entire administration is a part of and is responsible to Parliament. Our form of Government, however, is based on a system of checks and balances. If this system gets seriously out of balance at any point, the whole system is jeopardized, and the way is opened for the growth of tyranny.

CIA is the only major Federal agency over which Congress exercises no direct and formal control. Its budget and its personnel lists are classified. By law the agency can withhold even such obviously unimportant information as the salaries of its top officials.

It has been the tradition in both Houses of Congress to have individual, but corresponding, committees to handle legislation in both the House and Senate. We have the Committees on Agriculture, Finance, Judiciary, Foreign Relations, and so on. These committees generally correspond to executive departments or agencies in their jurisdiction.

The Congressional Directory lists CIA as an executive agency, directly responsible to the President; however, the other agencies and commissions under this listing are relatively small in number of employees and many act largely in an advisory capacity. We do not know how large CIA is, but according to plans for its new concentrated headquarters, it is no longer a small agency, if it ever was.

CIA is subject to congressional review by four established and fully authorized subcommittees, and I am sure that they are doing a creditable and fine job. But this is not enough. The Senators on these committees have many other things to consider, as members of the full Armed Services and Appropriations Committees. In addition, there is no staff to rely on. The Appropriation Committee's check on CIA is generally, I assume, when the executive budget request is up for consideration. The Armed Services Committee receives a periodic report, or at the committee's request. In addition, several checks have been made by independent groups, as we know. Even the recent Commission set up by the President functions only parttime, and will

⁹ Cheever, Daniel, and H. Field Haviland. *American Foreign Policy and the Separation of Powers*. P. 92.

make only a periodic check on the CIA. That is not what we need; these checks are fine, but we need a continual check on the operations of this agency which seems to be expanding continually. The most efficient method is by a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence.

There have been a number of reports recently that all is not well with the CIA. The Hoover Commission reported a woeful shortage of information about the Soviet Union, and noted that the agency could stand some internal administrative improvements. These are the sorts of inadequacies which the newly appointed Commission certainly will not allow, but congressional guardians might be able to compel even swifter and surer reform than could an executive committee.

Everything about CIA is clothed in secrecy. CIA is freed from practically every ordinary form of congressional review. Control of its expenditures is exempted from the provisions of law which prevent financial abuses in other Government agencies.

I agree that an intelligence agency must maintain secrecy to be effective. And I certainly do not mean to suggest that CIA should reprint for public consumption every item that comes across the Director's desk. If sources of information were inadvertently revealed, they would quickly dry up. Not only would the flow of information be cut off, but the lives of many would be seriously endangered. In addition, much of the value of the intelligence product would be lost if it were known that we possessed it. For these reasons, secrecy is obviously necessary.

However, there is a profound difference between an essential degree of secrecy to achieve a specific purpose and secrecy for the mere sake of secrecy. Once secrecy becomes sacrosanct, it invites abuse. If we accept the idea of secrecy for secrecy's sake we will have no way of knowing whether we have a very fine intelligence service or a very poor one.

If a new joint committee is set up as proposed in Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, all bills, resolutions, and other matters in the Senate or in the House of Representatives relating primarily to the CIA, would be referred to the joint committee; and the joint committee would, from time to time, make whatever reports are necessary to the Congress concerning its relationship with the CIA.

The enactment of the concurrent resolution would establish a joint committee, composed of 6 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 6 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Of the 6 Members to be appointed from the Senate, 3 shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and 3 shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate. The six House Members would be appointed from the corresponding subcommittees in the House. In each instance, not more than four members shall be of the same political party.

The joint committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof would be authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and to act at such places and times, to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deemed advisable. The committee would be, in addition, empowered to appoint a small, selective staff of persons having the highest possible clearance, and would be authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

The staff which I had envisioned for such a joint committee would be small and would be subject to the most rigorous security regulations. Such a staff of trained, specialized, and dedicated persons would assist the committee members in making checks and appraisals on CIA and its operation. There certainly should be no more risk in trusting classified information to a trusted few connected with a congressional committee than there would be to a trusted many in a Government agency.

It has been pointed out that there is too little legislation to require a committee of this nature. Admittedly, proposed legislation which would be referred to the suggested joint committee might have helped to resolve problems and to make suggestions in the controversy over the site of the proposed CIA building. As to other legislation, it is difficult to know what might have happened. We must remember that a joint committee would also be a defender of CIA against unwarranted and unjustified attacks from within and outside the Federal Government.

Mr. President, in my opinion, the CIA is in somewhat the same category as the Atomic Energy Commission; and just as a special committee, with well-defined authority and powers, has been created on a joint congressional basis to oversee and supervise the interests of AEC, so I believe that a joint congressional committee should be created for the same purpose in connection with the CIA. I realize full well, because of the very nature of the duties of the CIA, that there has been no public scrutiny of its activities. This may be necessary in this day and age, but I believe that a joint congressional committee should be created for the purpose of making certain that good management is maintained in the CIA and also to keep a constant check on its intelligence policies. It is well, too, that this joint committee should be in a position to criticize any mistakes which the CIA may make.

Until a committee of the kind this resolution proposes is established, there will be no way of knowing what serious flaws in the Central Intelligence Agency may be covered by the curtain of secrecy in which it is shrouded.

The creation of the new executive board to review intelligence fulfills partially the suggestion of the recent Hoover Commission report on intelligence. However, it is only a partial ful-

fillment of the Hoover Commission recommendations. The Hoover Commission, on two occasions, suggested a bipartisan committee, including Members of both Houses of Congress, empowered by law to ask and get whatever information it thought necessary to aid, guide, or restrain CIA.

Recommendation No. 2 of the recent intelligence activities report of the Hoover Commission reads as follows:

That a small, permanent, bipartisan commission, composed of Members of both Houses of the Congress and other public-spirited citizens commanding the utmost national respect and confidence, to be established by act of Congress to make periodic surveys of the organizations, functions, policies, and results of the Government agencies handling foreign intelligence operations; and to report, under adequate security safeguards, its findings and recommendations to the Congress, and to the President, annually and at such other times as may be necessary or advisable. The proposed watchdog commission should be empowered by law to demand and receive any information it needed for its own use. It would be patterned after the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (Hoover Commission). Appointments by the President of persons from private life to the proposed commission should be made from a select list of distinguished individuals of unquestioned loyalty, integrity, and ability, with records of unselfish service to the Nation.

Mr. President, I wish to state again that the appointment of the citizens' board should not preclude the establishment of a continuing and permanent congressional watchdog committee. Such a committee would act as a financial overseer, supervisor, guardian, sponsor, and defender of the CIA. It could give a constant and more thorough supervision to our intelligence activities than could any periodic check.

At the time of my appearance before the Rules Committee in behalf of this concurrent resolution I was informed by the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] that he voted against the creation of the civilian advisory group, and it is his belief that the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] joined him in this decision. Both of them, however, as members of the Hoover Commission, would recommend, according to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee for the CIA.

Two committees, the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee and the Joint Congressional Central Intelligence Committee, would be mutually supporting. They should insure as far as humanly possible, a proper support for and control of our powerful intelligence organizations. This a citizens' committee cannot do alone.

Before concluding my statement in behalf of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, I wish to comment briefly on the determined opposition to this measure being voiced by various members of the executive department. The determined effort to defeat this concurrent resolution is another instance of executive interference with a purely congressional function. In fact the President is

quoted in the press to have said, "It is too sensitive for Congress to take it up."

I am sure that I need not remind my colleagues here in the Senate that a concurrent resolution is not subject to Presidential approval or disapproval. It is the prerogative of the Congress to set up such a joint committee if it so desires.

Executive control has been on the increase in recent years, and I do not feel that this is good for a Federal government whose secure foundation is based upon a system of checks and balances between the executive, legislative, and judiciary.

As an illustration—and I have mentioned this before—I wish to remind my colleagues that last year the Congress appropriated an additional \$40 million in funds to maintain the Marine Corps budget at a more satisfactory strength, but these funds were not used as directed by Congress. In the American system each important segment of our governmental operation is subject to check by another segment. Such an important agency as CIA should not be left unchecked.

As has been so ably stated by New York Times columnist, Hanson Baldwin:

If war is too important to be left to the generals, it should be clear that intelligence is too important to be left unsupervised.

I firmly believe that it is now more imperative than ever that a joint congressional committee be created at the earliest opportunity. The representatives of the people are the ones who should be given, through a joint committee of Congress, the right to act for the Congress vis-a-vis the CIA, just as the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy does at the present time and has done for some years vis-a-vis the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The most convincing argument, in my opinion, for the adoption of the concurrent resolution is President Eisenhower's objection to it. When the President of the United States says that the matter of the CIA is too sensitive for Congress to take up, he shows the American people what many of us have long known, namely, his lack of understanding and appreciation of the legislative process of the Government, and the check and balance system of the Constitution.

I say to the President of the United States from the floor today that no topic of Government belonging to all the people of the country is too sensitive for the elected representatives of a free people to handle. It is about time the American people made that clear to the President. What the President needs is a refresher course on the constitutional system of our country.

For the President to say that Congress, acting under the legislative process of a concurrence resolution, seeks to deal with a subject matter which is too delicate for Congress to handle, shows that the President lacks a sensitivity and an understanding of our constitutional system itself. His very criticism of the Senator's concurrent resolution is, in my

opinion, a sound reason for the adoption of the concurrent resolution at the earliest possible hour.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that the Senate, likewise, should wake up to its responsibilities and should recognize the fact that what we are considering today is a resolution which will not, under any conditions, be sent to the White House. This is a matter for Congress itself to decide. I think Congress can take care of its own housekeeping, and is fully capable of rendering its own decisions and making its own judgments.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with that comment. One of the reasons why I am one of the cosponsors of the concurrent resolution is that it is long overdue that the Congress of the United States should assume its clear responsibility in this matter. We should proceed, without any hesitation, to give the people of the country a service they are entitled to have from us, by adopting the concurrent resolution, thus bringing the CIA under the surveillance of the Congress, and putting an end to this type of government by secrecy on the part of the President of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to agree fully with the viewpoints of the distinguished Senator from Montana.

EXHIBIT I

[From the Wall Street Journal of January 27, 1956]

THE LONE JUDGE

Mr. Allen Dulles, head of the cloak-and-dagger Central Intelligence Agency, opposes a bill now before the Senate which would create a congressional watchdog committee for CIA.

The bill would empower a 12-man committee drawn from the House and Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees to ask CIA how it's doing in intelligence matters and where the money's going that it spends. These are questions Congress cannot now ask.

Mr. Dulles doesn't like the idea; he says that if the bill becomes law there might be leaks of Agency secrets from the committee which might endanger the plans and programs of CIA. We can recall no important leaks from the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee which watchdogs the AEC.

Apparently a number of Senators don't agree with Mr. Dulles' ideas on the subject. Thirty-five of them sponsored the watchdog bill under which Mr. Dulles will have to leak some information to the Congress which created the secret agency. Mr. Dulles may make no mistakes in assessing intelligence; but he should not be the lone judge in matters that have to do with the intentions of other nations for war or peace.

[From the Butte Standard of January 29, 1956]

OUR INTELLIGENCE HAS BEEN FOUND WANTING

A Hoover Commission task force looked into the operations of the highly-secretive Central Intelligence Agency last spring and came up with this conclusion: "The task force is deeply concerned over the lack of adequate intelligence data from behind the Iron Curtain."

The task force also found: "Effective intelligence has become increasingly necessary

for our protection against propaganda, infiltration and aggressions of the Communist leaders. By trial and error, study and skill, we have made progress; but we must not labor under any complacent delusions."

Reflecting upon this incident, as well as upon the fact that not all of the Hoover commission's recommendations have been carried out, might cause one to wonder if lack of intelligence about what is happening behind the Iron Curtain is not the direct cause of a lot of disorder in Washington.

The number of contradicting statements relative to the armed strength of the Soviet Union would indicate that we don't know very much about what the Soviet has. This fact could easily be the cause of much of the disunity in our own defense department.

If a commander is in the dark about what kind of opposition he is likely to run into, he is in a similar manner in the dark as to how to prepare for the contingency of conflict.

So, it seems that our intelligence may be at fault, although the Hoover Commission task force found at least 12 major departments and agencies dealing in intelligence in one form or another.

The lack of knowledge would similarly have a blighting effect on the conduct of our foreign policy. It might even cause a war, whereas if our intelligence had been more complete war could have been avoided.

One of the recommendations made by the task force was that the President appoint a committee of experienced citizens to examine and report to him periodically on the work of the Government foreign intelligence activities. It was directed that the President might make public such findings as he saw fit.

Such a committee has just been appointed by President Eisenhower. It includes such personages as Robert A. Lovett, former Secretary of Defense.

The other part of the recommendations made public had to do with Congress. It was recommended that the Congress consider creating a joint congressional committee on foreign intelligence, similar to that on atomic energy.

It would be the duty of the two committees to collaborate on matters of special importance to the national security.

Congress as yet has not acted.

There was still a third part of the Hoover Commission report which dealt with the highest security classification. It was sent directly to the President.

Needless to say, the American people would rest easier if they knew more about and had greater confidence in our intelligence organizations.

On the reverse side, it has been demonstrated time and again the Communists have a world-wide intelligence system which works at a very high degree of efficiency.

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 20, 1956]

CIA LEADERS ARE COOL TO WATCHDOG PROPOSAL

(By Richard Fryklund)

The Central Intelligence Agency enthusiastically obeys the law which imposes strictest secrecy on its activities, but the Agency still is subject to the scrutiny of several outside executive and congressional groups.

Soon—possibly Wednesday—a group with the sole function of watchdogging the CIA is expected to get Senate Rules Committee approval.

Backers of the watchdog committee say that while it is true that four congressional subcommittees, the Budget Bureau and a new presidential commission all do look at some facets of the CIA, no congressional group keeps a close, constant check on it the way the Joint Atomic Energy Committee watches the also-secret Atomic Energy Commission.

COOL TO SCRUTINY

The CIA is reported to be cool toward the watchdog idea. But perhaps the most distasteful part of the expected Rules Committee approval of the bill will be the public attention sure to follow.

The job of the CIA is to gather intelligence and coordinate the intelligence activities of more than a score of other agencies.

The genesis of the CIA goes back to the day Japanese bombs shattered the morning calm at Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941. American intelligence agencies knew that raid was coming, but the information was never properly used.

To protect against future Pearl Harbors, a National Intelligence Authority was set up immediately after the war body created a Central Intelligence Group that grew into the Central Intelligence Agency. The job of the Agency is to gather foreign intelligence, which includes spying in the traditional sense as well as research into more conventional sources; coordinate intelligence activities of other agencies, and assemble the material in usable form and deliver it to the policymakers in time.

WEEKLY MEETINGS

Director of Central Intelligence Allen Dulles meets once a week with the heads of Army, Navy, and Air Force intelligence, the National Security Agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the intelligence sections of the executive departments, to draw up summaries of latest estimates of a potential enemy's capabilities and to predict the potential enemy's probable course of action.

These estimates—and often vigorous dissenting opinions—are taken the next day to the National Security Council by Mr. Dulles. Sitting on the council are President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, Secretary of State Dulles, Secretary of Defense Wilson, and Office of Defense Mobilization Director Arthur S. Flemming.

How the CIA arrives at the intelligence estimate and the nature of the estimates themselves are things the potential enemy would very much like to know. To guard that information, the CIA was given unprecedented powers of secrecy by Congress.

CAN SET OWN PAY SCALES

The 1947 act setting up the agency specifies that the director need not make his spending public or explain the agency's organization or the identity of its personnel, its methods of operation or its sources. Mr. Dulles can hire or fire whom he pleases and set his own salary scales. He can bring as many as 100 unidentified aliens into this country every year, and he can hand out bribes to foreign code clerks or finance beautiful blonds in Vienna apartments.

There are some checks on the CIA, however. The agency is directly under the President and the National Security Council and must justify its activities there. And the CIA budget must be defended in detail before a small group of Budget Bureau officials.

An eight-man board of consultants was named by President Eisenhower last month to review semiannually the work of the CIA. Its chairman is Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The group has set up shop with a small staff in the executive offices building. It will report directly to the President, and only a few innocuous parts of each report will be made public.

The CIA also is checked by four subcommittees of Congress, made up of 17 Congressmen, the senior members of the House and Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees.

The CIA tells the appropriations subcommittees as much as they want to know about the agency's budget. Figures are not

made public. They are concealed in the published Federal budget, in fact, by being scattered through appropriations for other agencies.

GET COMPLETE ANSWERS

The Armed Services Subcommittees receive intelligence reports and complete answers, according to Senator RUSSELL, to all questions asked about CIA activities.

The annual spending of the CIA is known only to the Appropriations Subcommittees. Many guesses have been made—ranging from a few hundred million dollars a year up to more than a billion. But the Hoover Commission said other intelligence agencies outspend the CIA, so it is perhaps a fair guess to say the CIA budget is around \$100 million and that the agency employs about 15,000 full-time persons.

HEADQUARTERS NO SECRET

Headquarters of the agency is a group of aged brick buildings at 2430 E Street NW. Its location is no secret. Any cab driver can take you there if you just ask for the Central Intelligence Agency.

Once you are there, however, you cannot enter any building unless you're on business. Security restrictions inside, of course, are maximum. No visitor wanders through the halls alone. Guards are everywhere.

Much of the work—perhaps 90 percent—is routine research in unclassified documents—foreign publications, phone books, technical journals, newspapers, and the like. It is not the material, but the way it is put together and the conclusions that can be drawn that are important.

A minor number of employees are engaged in cloak-and-dagger activities abroad.

NO DOMESTIC FUNCTIONS

The CIA has no domestic function, according to the law, but every once in a while a CIA man turns up with a bit of domestic intelligence—such as the time an agent reported erroneously that Far East specialist Owen Lattimore was about to leave the country.

Job applications are mistrusted—they might be from Communists trying to gain entry—and the Agency likes to seek out its own prospective employees. Higher echelon workers are recruited through personal contact.

Of all persons who formally apply for jobs with the CIA, more than 82 percent are rejected by personnel or security officials. Every employee must undergo a full FBI security check.

As director of Central Intelligence, Mr. Dulles, brother of the Secretary of State, is head of the CIA and coordinator of all Government intelligence activities. Mr. Dulles, 62 years old, has had a long career in diplomacy, international law and spying. His exploits as an OSS agent in Switzerland during World War II have become spy-thriller classics.

He is as friendly and shaggy as a St. Bernard, dresses in rumpled tweeds and baggy sweaters, and gestures with a pipe. His appearance creates two impressions valuable to him: He is a man you can trust; he has nothing to hide.

Mr. Dulles' deputy is Lt. Gen. Charles P. Cabell, formerly director of the Joint Staff of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and intelligence director of the Air Force. He is 50 years old.

Head of the CIA's technical intelligence is a former Harvard law professor, Robert Amory, Jr. He is 39.

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 21, 1956]

PRODUCT OF CIA EXPENSES QUERIED ON CAPITOL HILL

(By Richard Fryklund)

Several Congressmen who are not on 1 of the 4 unpublicized subcommittees which have contact with the Central Intelligence

Agency want to know if the country is getting its money's worth out of the supersecret organization.

"The average Member of Congress knows no more about the CIA than what he reads in the papers," said Representative MCCARTHY, Democrat of Minnesota. "We don't know how much the group spends or what it produces, and that disturbs many of us."

"I doubt if even Chairman VINSON, of the Armed Services Subcommittee on the CIA, knows enough about the Agency—and, of course, what he does know he quite properly keeps to himself."

Neither Representative MCCARTHY nor other backers of bills to set up a House-Senate committee to "watchdog" the CIA want the Agency's affairs made public. Nor do they believe the CIA is grossly maladministered.

CHECK IS SOUGHT

But they do believe that the interests of good government require that a standing committee keep a continual check on the CIA.

"Such a committee would not pass on much information either," Mr. MCCARTHY said, "but it could assure other Congressmen and the public that the CIA is operating efficiently."

Whether the CIA is a topflight intelligence organization spending its money judiciously, no one is in a position to say publicly. Most criticism is necessarily uninformed, and the CIA never answers back openly.

Allen Dulles, Director of Central Intelligence, will sometimes call a critic in for a private chat or will drop a note of protest to the editor of a paper which he thinks has attacked the CIA injudiciously.

The most authoritative criticism has come from the Hoover Commission task force, headed by Gen. Mark Clark. The group was given full access to CIA secrets. In a public report filed last June (there was another classified report given to the President) the Commission gave the CIA this indorsement:

"On the basis of its comprehensive studies the task force feels that the American people can and should give their full confidence and support to the intelligence program."

DULLES' BURDEN CITED

But there were also these specific criticisms:

Director Dulles has taken on too many burdensome duties and responsibilities himself.

There is not enough concentration on collection of intelligence information from behind the Iron Curtain.

The glamour and excitement of some aspects of the work sometimes overshadows other vital functions.

There is not enough machinery available for outside surveillance of the CIA.

On the first criticism, the Hoover Commission was whistling into the wind. Mr. Dulles, considered one of the world's master intelligence experts by the cognoscenti, loves his work and is not about to turn the fun over to subordinates. If anything, he has assumed more responsibilities since the Clark report.

Mr. Dulles does not tense up under responsibility. His friends believe he can safely assume more work than could another administrator.

REDS TOUGH TO PENETRATE

The quality of intelligence from the Soviet Union, Red China, and the satellites does not satisfy Mr. Dulles. The Communist countries are tougher to penetrate than Germany was during World War II, and spying there is an exceedingly difficult job.

The problem of glamour versus grubbing always will be with the CIA. Employees have no reward except their Government salaries and inward satisfaction. The occasionally

exciting assignment is what keeps many employees on the job.

A Hoover Commission recommendation for a Presidential panel to examine the CIA periodically was approved by Mr. Dulles, and the panel is now operating. Another recommendation for a congressional watchdog committee has been ignored officially by the CIA.

Senator MANSFIELD, author of a watchdog bill scheduled to be approved by the Senate Rules Committee tomorrow, believes that Mr. Dulles opposes his bill on two grounds: The present intermittent contacts with congressional committees are very satisfactory, and the more persons who know about CIA activities, the more difficult it will be to maintain secrecy.

SUCCESS AND FAILURE

The proof of the CIA pudding lies, of course, in the eating. What are the successes and failures of the group?

Again one runs into uninformed opinion and "no comment." Critics say the CIA muffed the Red Chinese invasion of North Korea, the release by South Korean President Rhee of the Red prisoners of war during the truce negotiations and the recent Soviet economic penetration of South Asia. They say the CIA has lost friends for America in Burma by maintaining a group of Nationalist Chinese guerrillas there, and the CIA agents have messed unsuccessfully in palace revolutions in several countries.

These are the answers:

No one knows when the CIA muffs because the Agency's responsibility ends when it has gathered and evaluated the intelligence. If this country was caught off base in North Korea, it may be because men responsible for policy and action did not properly use the intelligence available.

There are some well-known successes. The CIA is credited with the overthrow of the Red-oriented government of Guatemala and the Iranian regime of Premier Mossadegh. In both instances, apparently, CIA agents helped organize and supply the opposing, more democratic, forces.

STILL HAS BUGS IN IT

The CIA is a new agency, organized in 1947, so it certainly has bugs to be worked out.

Its biggest administrative problem is personnel. Mr. Dulles pays civil-service wage scales, yet he needs employees of high intellectual quality. A young man who can get money, public prestige, and the admiration of his wife by doing a good job in law or business has little inclination to bury his talents in the CIA—where he can't even boast to his wife.

Relatively low pay and complete anonymity has lost many good men for Mr. Dulles. The Director is sufficiently worried about it that he personally examines the problems of all persons above clerical level who submit resignations.

He does not expect to solve the personnel problem. He hopes to ease it by making working conditions more attractive. That is why he wants a new campus headquarters for the CIA in a pleasant residential area near Langley, Va.

Security within CIA walls is a constant problem. The Hoover Commission said, however, that the CIA handles it well—that there apparently has been no effective Communist penetration of the agency. Lower-level employees have been ousted, however, for alleged subversive associations.

There comes a final area of criticism: The trivial secrecy rules that are always good for laughs at Washington cocktail parties.

CAN'T REVEAL JOB

Except for a half dozen topmost employees, CIA workers are not permitted to say publicly where they work. So frequently when a group of Government people get together to talk shop there will be one man in the

crowd who will say, "I can't tell you where I work." The group laughs and says, "CIA."

When one telephones the CIA—the number is in the book—an operator answers with the phone number, under the impression, it seems that she can keep secret the outfit one is calling.

And the CIA used to get along without an identifying sign on the gate—despite the fact most any cab driver can take a passenger there without directions.

The CIA knows everyone is laughing, but maintains there are good reasons for the cloak and dagger stuff. What the reasons are specifically, it won't say, but apparently the agency believes a few extra precautions are worth the general merriment.

[From the New York Times of February 22, 1956]

GOP SENATORS BACK CIA CHECK—POLICY GROUP BRUSHES ASIDE EISENHOWER'S OPPOSITION TO CONGRESSIONAL GROUP

WASHINGTON, February 21.—Senate Republicans brushed aside today President Eisenhower's objections to a special congressional committee to check on the Central Intelligence Agency.

They indicated that they would give active, and possibly unanimous, support to the basic principle of a bill by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat of Montana, calling for a CIA committee similar to the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, which keeps watch on the Atomic Energy Commission.

The intelligence agency gathers worldwide information on action and intentions of other nations.

The Republican Senators obviously were miffed by what they regarded as the President's implied lack of trust in Congress' discretion in handling super-secret intelligence matters.

President Eisenhower created a special eight-man citizen's commission on the CIA in January, but it contained no Members of Congress. It also was directed to report directly to the President with no provision for congressional review.

Senator STYLES BRIDGES of New Hampshire, chairman of the Senate Republican Policy Committee, told reporters after the regular weekly luncheon of all Republican members that the group had been advised the President was "very much opposed" to the MANSFIELD bill.

"He [the President] said it was too sensitive for Congress to take it up," Senator BRIDGES declared.

BRIDGES NOT IMPRESSED

Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND of California, the Senate Republican leader, told the policy group of the President's views. Senator BRIDGES said that the news did not impress him, nor did it have any noticeable effect on other Republican members.

Senator BRIDGES declared that most of his colleagues seemed to believe the President, in his creation of the citizens' advisory board, had indirectly suggested that intelligence bearing on this country's security was "too delicate" for Congress to handle.

He said that this implication that outsiders were more to be trusted than Members of Congress had "annoyed" the Senators and brought them "much nearer" the Mansfield bill. The measure already has 34 cosponsors on both sides of the aisle.

As matters now stand, the CIA is the only major Federal agency over which Congress exercises no direct and formal control. Its budget and its personnel lists are classified, and the only supervision Congress exercises is through subcommittees of the Senate and House Appropriations and Armed Services Committees. Even these receive only sketchy reports on the agency's activities.

ALLEN DULLES OPPOSES MOVE

The Director of the Agency, Allen W. Dulles, a brother of John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, has argued against creation of a congressional committee on the ground that members might leak vital secrets to the press.

Senator MANSFIELD and other Members of Congress have retorted that members of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee have not leaked information about the activities of that highly sensitive agency.

The Mansfield bill would create a 12-man joint committee, to be composed of 3 members each from the House and Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Subcommittee. It would be empowered to maintain a constant check on the budget, personnel, and general activities of the intelligence Agency.

The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government recently urged creation of a permanent bipartisan commission on intelligence that would include Members of both Houses of Congress and other public-spirited citizens * * * empowered by law to demand and receive any information it needed for its own use.

[From the Washington Daily News of February 25, 1956]

THIS ONE IS ESSENTIAL

In its report on our intelligence agencies, and more particularly the Central Intelligence Agency which is overall top dog, the Hoover Commission said in effect we are pretty fair. But—

It was deeply concerned about the lack of adequate information from behind the Iron Curtain.

And it went on to report other findings which led to the conclusion that our intelligence is not as good as it ought to be. It ought to be superlative.

"Intelligence," said the Hoover task force, "deals with all things which should be known in advance of initiating a course of action."

Whatever we do, militarily, politically, diplomatically, economically, in world affairs, is hit or miss unless it is based on facts.

Our ability to exist and survive in this kind of world depends on assembling the facts, faithfully, and promptly, and then on correct evaluation of the facts. There is evidence that we have missed on both points, too often.

That could be fatal.

The Central Intelligence Agency is a big, top secret, costly operation. Nobody in it will tell you the time of day. We don't want 'em to. But—

"The people who support these operations are entitled to assurance that the investment is paying dividends."

So said the Hoover Commission. So, in effect, said President Eisenhower, who then appointed an independent, civilian committee to keep watch on the CIA. An able committee, too.

Now the Senate Rules Committee has cleared a resolution creating a Senate-House committee to do the same thing. This the Hoover Commission also recommended. It makes good sense.

Congress ought to know whether the CIA is doing its job. It ought not to just think it is doing O. K. It ought to know, positively.

This joint committee is the way to know. Senate and House should pass this resolution as an urgent safeguard of our national interest.

[From the Washington Daily News of February 25, 1956]

CHECK IS URGED ON CIA (By Marshall McNeil)

The chief United States spy and counter-spy bureau—the little known and highly secret Central Intelligence Agency—has been

accused by a Senate committee of unquestionably placing itself above other Government departments.

The Senate Rules Committee with this accusation has recommended creation of a permanent congressional committee to keep an eye on CIA. There was one dissenter.

Its recommendation comes after 35 Senators and 25 Members of the House have sponsored bills to provide continuing congressional surveillance of this agency whose every aspect is now, the committee said, beclouded with secrecy.

The pattern for the special "kibitzing" congressional committee was set in the first law turning our atomic-energy enterprise over to civilian control. The atomic "watchdog" committee is generally regarded as having done a first-class job in keeping an eye on our atomic advances.

In World War I, the Rules Committee said, the United States "had no intelligence service equal to the name." Between the two World Wars, reliance in this field was placed upon the military services and the State Department.

As World War II started, the Office of Coordinator of Information was set up to collect and analyze information bearing upon national defense. This was transformed into the Office of Strategic Services. In 1947, Congress established the National Security Council and under it the present CIA.

Although it has immense powers, worldwide operations, and many millions to spend, CIA is listed with four lines of type in the Congressional Directory. These give its name, main address and telephone number, and the names of its two bosses: The Director, Allen W. Dulles, brother of the Secretary of State, and the Deputy Director, Lt. Gen. C. P. Cabell, an Air Force officer.

The Rules Committee found these studies insufficient. "It is not enough," its report says, "that CIA be responsible alone to the White House or the National Security Council. Such responsibility should be shared with Congress in a more complete manner."

"It is agreed that an intelligence agency must maintain secrecy to be effective," the Rules Committee said. "There is, however, a profound difference between an essential degree of secrecy to achieve a specific purpose and secrecy for the mere sake of secrecy. Secrecy now beclouds everything about CIA, its cost, its personnel, its efficiency, its failures, its successes."

"The CIA has unquestionably placed itself above other Government agencies. * * * It is difficult to legislate intelligently if there is a dearth of information upon which Congress must rely * * * to protect the public welfare * * *"

[From the San Francisco Examiner of February 28, 1956]
ANOTHER LOOK

President Eisenhower is reported to be very much opposed to a bill sponsored by Senator MANSFIELD of Montana, and already approved by the Senate Rules Committee, which would set up a joint Senate-House "watchdog" committee to check on the operations of the Central Intelligence Agency.

If this is true, we think the President should take another look at the matter.

He is right that the CIA is a sensitive operation, being mainly concerned with what goes on secretly behind the diplomatic and military scenes at international levels.

But immunity from scrutiny is a dangerous thing to grant under any system of government, and it is particularly repugnant in a democracy where the people are the masters rather than the servants of Government.

It seems to borrow a page out of the book of rules of the authoritarian state, to suggest that neither the people nor their representatives in Congress are entitled to hold any agency of Government accountable for its acts and expenditures.

Every bureaucrat covets that immunity, and most bureaucrats think they could do better jobs under it, and perhaps there are even some who could be safely entrusted with it.

But the bureaucratic aspiration to be free of all responsibility to the people is always the forerunner of tyranny, because it not only gives freedom of action to the sincere and the worthy but it also provides a cover for the mistakes and crimes of the inefficient and the corrupt.

There are many so-called sensitive agencies in Government, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, but it is doubtful if blank check authority would increase their usefulness to the Nation.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 12, 1956]

CONTROL OVER CIA NOT IMPRACTICAL

(Extension of remarks of Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, March 8, 1956)

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to recommend to the attention of the membership of this body an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on March 6, 1956, entitled "Some Congressional Control Over CIA Is Not Impractical."

During the last 3 years I have exerted repeated efforts on behalf of the proposal to establish a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters. I have first outlined my proposal on this subject in House Concurrent Resolution 169, 83d Congress, and reintroduced it, in an amended version, in House Concurrent Resolution 28, 84th Congress, together with over a score of my distinguished colleagues.

It is my sincere hope that the House Rules Committee will report House Concurrent Resolution 28 in the near future.

"SOME CONGRESSIONAL CONTROL OVER CIA IS NOT IMPRACTICAL"

"For several years there has been a rash of resolutions in Congress calling for an agency to watch over the Central Intelligence Agency, our top cloak and dagger corps."

"The second Hoover Commission called for the same thing. It suggested that a small, permanent Commission composed of a bipartisan representation from Congress and distinguished private citizens handle the job."

"President Eisenhower has gone halfway. He recently named a civilian Commission in the executive branch to serve as watchdog and report to him. But he has shied away from letting Congress in on the act. This hasn't stilled demands that Congress take a hand in watching an agency for which it appropriates money. Senator MANSFIELD, Democrat, Montana, has come up with a bill to create a joint committee of both Houses of Congress to work with the CIA. The Senate Rules Committee has agreed to congressional action on the bill and it has attracted a large measure of support."

"The Hoover Commission pointed out that the CIA, because it needs a large degree of secrecy to operate, is exempted by law from rules that control other Government agencies. For instance, the General Services Administration, the Government's housekeeper, has no control over CIA at all. CIA is exempted from compliance with any provision of law limiting transfers of appropriations; any requirements for publication or disclosure of the organization, functions, names, official titles, salaries, or numbers of personnel employed by the agency; and any regulations relating to the expenditure of Government funds."

"Such exemptions are, by and large, proper. The Atomic Energy Commission has similar exemptions. But Congress does have to appropriate funds for the CIA. It created the Agency and set its scope of activities. Surely someone in Congress should be given at

least peek enough to make sure that CIA is operating efficiently and properly. This is particularly true because of criticisms—some from the Hoover Commission itself—of some shortcomings in CIA."

"The AEC, which hoards secrets, too, has a joint congressional committee which is given enough of a picture to judge whether the organization is handling Government funds properly. The joint committee has worked exceedingly well, and without weakening national security. The same sort of committee could do the same sort of job for CIA. It wouldn't have to be told everything—and shouldn't."

"But Congress ought to be able to determine whether the dagger is being kept sharp and the cloak is kept cleaned and pressed and buttoned. It's basic that Congress, with control of the purse, must get enough information to make an informed judgment on how the purse is expended."

"That's all MANSFIELD and others want—and it's little enough to ask."

[From the Wall Street Journal of January 18, 1956]

A CHECK ON THE WATCH

Recently President Eisenhower announced the appointment of a committee of eight citizens to serve as watchdog over the Central Intelligence Agency. Their duties will be to review periodically the workings of the supersecret CIA and report their suggestions and give their advice to the Chief Executive. So far so good.

But there is a serious question whether the authority of the committee goes far enough. The CIA is clothed in such secrecy that even the Congress cannot ask about its inner activities. By law it can withhold even such obviously unimportant information as the salaries of its top officials. Its adventures are known only to a few people. The gentlemen serving on Mr. Eisenhower's committee will have neither power nor control over CIA. And there is a question how much they will be permitted to learn under the Agency's broad charter.

There is the further question whether this committee will be able to make public anything they may learn about CIA doing the wrong things or not doing enough of the right things. The reports are to go to the executive department and no executive department under whatever administration likes to see errors or shortcomings publicly revealed. In the case of CIA, an Executive order could clothe in secrecy whatever the watchdog committee thought should be revealed even from the Congress on the ground that revelation might injure the country.

It has been said that the appointment of the committee follows the suggestion of the Hoover Commission. The fact is that it does not. The Hoover Commission suggested a bipartisan committee including Members of both Houses of Congress empowered by law to ask and get whatever information it thought necessary to aid, guide, or restrain CIA.

Though nearly everything CIA does is secret, there is no secret about one thing. CIA is run by men, and though the men who run it may be more intelligent than other men they still may make mistakes as do all other men. Slight errors in intelligence assessment may not, individually, amount to a very great deal; collectively, they could have the most serious consequences. To set a national policy on a wrong course because of compounded errors could be more dangerous than no intelligence agency at all.

We hope no one will read into these remarks a suggestion that CIA run off carbon copies for all who ask about its activities; that would be as silly as it would be unwise to leave CIA answerable only to itself.

Neither do we suggest that CIA is not doing its job properly; we could not so suggest, for even the Congress does not know

whether it is or not. And that is precisely our point.

Surely the Congress, with its power to declare war, has a responsibility to watch carefully over an agency it created to stand watch in that shadowland between peace and war.

[From the New York Times of January 15, 1956]

WATCHDOG OF THE CIA—AN EVALUATION OF THE PRESIDENT'S ACTION IN NAMING BOARD TO REVIEW INTELLIGENCE

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The President's appointment last week of an eight-man board to review periodically the Nation's intelligence activities is a step in the right direction. But unfortunately it does not go far enough.

The establishment of the citizen's commission was approved by Allen W. Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. The action will be interpreted on one hand as an attempt to head off the establishment of a congressional watchdog committee on the Intelligence Agency. On the other hand it lends tacit support to frequent and repeated criticisms of our intelligence services, particularly of the CIA.

The recent Hoover Commission report on intelligence activities recommended the establishment of a permanent bipartisan commission on intelligence. But it suggested a different form from that announced last week.

The Hoover Commission urged the inclusion of "Members of both Houses of the Congress and other public-spirited citizens . . . empowered by law to demand and receive any information it needed for its own use."

The President's board has no congressional members. Although it has executive authority for support it does not have the legal authority that congressional enactment could give. In other words, it is not powerful enough or broad enough. Nor will it have sufficient continuity.

CIA UNDER CRITICISM

Nevertheless the reputation, experience, and character of the eight appointees, who include Robert A. Lovett, former Secretary of Defense, give promise that the board will, in fact, as the President suggested, "make a real contribution to the task of Government." It is well fitted to take a fresh outside look at intelligence, even though it has no authority and will be able merely to suggest and advise rather than to control and supervise.

But there have been so many intelligence failures, so much friction, and such sharp criticism, particularly of the CIA, that the appointment of the citizens board should not preclude the establishment of a continuing and permanent congressional watchdog committee.

Such a committee could act, in the same manner as the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee, as purse watcher, supervisor, guardian, sponsor, and defender of the CIA. It could give a constant and more thorough supervision to our intelligence activities than could any periodic check.

The two committees, working together, would be mutually supporting. They should insure as far as human checks and balances can do, a proper support for, and control of, our powerful intelligence organizations. This the citizen committee alone cannot do.

The need for such support and control should be obvious. As the President said, "prompt and accurate intelligence is essential to the policymaking branches of Government." But it is more than that. It could mean national life or death in the atomic age.

On the other hand, uncontrolled secret intelligence agencies are in a position to dominate policymaking, and hence govern-

ment. Their very secrecy gives them power; there are few to accept or reject their findings. Their facts do not pass through the sieve of congressional debate or public inquiry. Few, even in the executive branch, know what they do.

The CIA, for instance, by the very breadth of its charter, is beyond the normal checks and balances of the law. An overpowerful secret intelligence agency is dangerous, not alone to the formulation of sound policy, but to the viability of democratic institutions.

RECORD IS SPOTTY

The intelligence record of the Nation and of the Central Intelligence Agency in particular is spotty. There have been notable successes but also notable failures. The Hoover Commission's public critique was positively critical of some of our shortcomings.

The secret report of the same Hoover Commission task force on intelligence is far more critical.

Lt. Gen. James H. Doolittle, a member of the President's new board, investigated CIA and other intelligence activities in Germany a year ago and found much overlapping and ineffectiveness.

Late this summer, Maj. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Assistant Chief of Staff of the Army for Intelligence, was relieved after Mr. Dulles had sent a long and detailed bill of complaints against General Trudeau to the Pentagon.

A great many other incidents also suggest that all is not well with our intelligence establishment.

It can only profit from the new committee. But it could profit more from a permanent congressional watchdog committee. If war is too important to be left to the generals, it should be clear that intelligence is too important to be left unsupervised.

**CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR THE
HOOPER REPORT,
Washington, D. C., March 5, 1956.
Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.**

DEAR SENATOR: During a recent conference in Helena, Mont., the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report passed a resolution supporting your Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 which implements recommendation No. 1B of the Hoover Commission Report on Intelligence Activities in the Federal Government.

The attached editorial which appeared in the February 28 issue of the San Francisco Examiner also supports your resolution. We would appreciate very much if you would have the Citizens Committee resolution and this editorial inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Very truly yours,
HARVEY HANCOCK,
Regional Director.

**CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR THE
HOOPER REPORT,
Washington, D. C., March 13, 1956.
The Honorable MIKE J. MANSFIELD,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.**

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: I am gratified to learn that you are anxious to have the views of the Citizens Committee on the Hoover Report concerning Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, that you have introduced in the Senate.

This Concurrent Resolution would create a Joint Congressional Committee on Central Intelligence to "make continuing studies of the Central Intelligence Agency and of problems relating to the gathering of intelligence affecting the national security and its coordination and utilization by the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government." The Com-

mittee would be composed of six Members from each House of Congress.

The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government recommended in its report on Intelligence Activities:

"That the Congress consider creating a Joint Congressional Committee on Foreign Intelligence, similar to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy."

This recommendation was based on a detailed study of our intelligence activities that was made for the Commission by a group of eminent citizens. This group pointed out concerning the Central Intelligence Agency that:

"The act" (creating it) "exempts the Agency from compliance with any provision of law limiting transfers of appropriations; any requirements for publication or disclosure of the organization, functions, names, official titles, salaries, or numbers of personnel employed by the Agency; and any regulations relating to the expenditure of Government funds. . . ."

"The task force fully realizes that the Central Intelligence Agency, as a major fountain of intelligence for the Nation, must of necessity operate in an atmosphere of secrecy and with an unusual amount of freedom and independence. Obviously, it cannot achieve its full purpose if subjected to open scrutiny and the extensive checks and balances which apply to the average governmental agency.

"Because of its peculiar position, the CIA has been freed by the Congress from outside surveillance of its operations and its fiscal accounts. There is always a danger that such freedom from restraints could inspire laxity and abuses which might prove costly to the American people."

Thus, this group of able citizens found that there was no effective control over intelligence agencies. On principle, such a situation is undesirable, but in addition the task force found that there were defects in the organization and function of our intelligence agencies. Thus it concluded that:

"The task force is deeply concerned over the lack of adequate intelligence from behind the Iron Curtain. Proper directional emphasis, aggressive leadership, boldness and persistence are essential to achieve desired results."

"The task force feels that certain administrative flaws have developed in the CIA, which must be corrected to give proper emphasis and direction to its basic responsibilities."

These conclusions of the task force were endorsed by the Commission.

It is significant that the first Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government in 1949 in its report on the National Security Organization recommended (Recommendation 4c):

"That vigorous steps be taken to improve the Central Intelligence Agency and its work."

The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government in its 1955 report on Intelligence Activities was anxious that Congress have adequate information concerning the operation of our foreign intelligence activities while still preserving the secrecy required for national security.

I am pleased to inform you that the Citizens Committee on the Hoover Report believes that House Concurrent Resolution 2, would if enacted implement fully the recommendations of the Commission that there be created a Joint Congressional Committee on Foreign Intelligence.

Yours sincerely,
CLARENCE FRANCIS,
Chairman.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO WEDNESDAY AT 11 O'CLOCK A. M.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until Wednesday, April 11, 1956, at 11 o'clock a. m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to speak very briefly on the subject matter of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2. When the Senate discusses the subject again on Wednesday, I hope to make further remarks in more detail concerning it. I may add that I respect the sincerity of the Senator from Montana in submitting the concurrent resolution. He has discussed the matter a number of times, and I know he believes in the objective of the resolution and the creation of such a joint committee as is provided for. Personally, I do not think the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency would be improved by the creation of another joint congressional committee.

Mr. President, all of us want security for our country, and all of us want our country to have the best possible defenses. All of us want the best and most accurate intelligence reports to be obtained. All of us want to protect the lives of those who are engaged in this work. All of us want to protect our sources of information. There is no difference between us in regard to these matters. The difference comes in regard to the methods to be employed.

First, let me say that the Federal Bureau of Investigation—an agency whose work and whose leader all of us respect—provides us with sources of information within the United States. There is no criticism of the FBI of which I know; there is no effort to set up a joint committee to supervise it.

Second, our intelligence sources, which provide us with information from outside the United States are threefold: One is the State Department, which has its ambassadors and consuls and their staffs. Next, there are the armed services, which have their official aides in our embassies. Finally, there is the CIA. In broad outline, that Agency does for us outside the United States the work the FBI does inside the United States.

Let me say that there is complete coordination and almost daily interchange between these two agencies concerning information and intelligence. Naturally, the methods of the CIA are different from those of the FBI. The methods of operation of the CIA vary in the several countries where it operates; but its aim is to provide the United States with information which will help us to be more secure, and to carry out within its jurisdiction the orders which may be given it by the highest executive agency which protects us, namely, the National Security Council.

Some of the work of the CIA may be done in the open. But most of its work is absolutely under cover. If it were not under cover, the CIA would not function, for the simple reason that its sources of information would dry up very quickly; in many places its agents would be quickly liquidated or forcibly evacuated. So one point is crystal clear: There is no secrecy for secrecy's sake. There is secrecy because by means of secrecy, results can be obtained. Without secrecy, nothing would be accomplished, and the lives of many brave men would be sacrificed. In broad outline, that is the situation which confronts us today.

As the majority report points out, before World War II we had no service of this character. Instead, we relied upon our friends in other nations, or upon our guesses, or upon whatever information the State Department or the armed services could pick up. But we soon found that was not enough for the strongest free nation to have, in order to function. So President Roosevelt asked Colonel Donovan to organize the OSS. It functioned under his leadership during the war years. Later, its work was continued by two agencies created by Executive order, until the National Security Act in 1947 created the Central Intelligence Agency, as we know it today. The amendments to the National Security Act of 1947 which were passed in 1949 set up its procedures.

The CIA is essentially an executive agency under the direction of the National Security Council, which is the highest policymaking body for our security. The functions of the CIA are threefold, in broad general outline: First, intelligence, both covert and overt; second, activities ordered by the National Security Council; third, the coordination of intelligence. It coordinates that intelligence in Washington and reports it to the National Security Council. The CIA is not, I repeat, a policymaking body.

As has been pointed out, at the present time the CIA is supervised by subcommittees of the congressional Armed Services Committees, under whose jurisdiction the CIA comes, and by subcommittees of the Appropriations Committees of the Congress. If the work of the Members of Congress who serve on those subcommittees is not well done, the members of those subcommittees should be blamed. Let that be done, instead of creating a new agency to duplicate or take over the work which now is being done by 2 regular, legalized committees of the Senate and 2 regular, legalized committees of the House of Representatives.

As the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has said, several commissions have studied the work of the CIA and have submitted reports thereon. That was done by the Hoover Commission, and also by the so-called Clark Commission, headed by General Mark Clark, which I believe served under the Hoover Commission. Its report was made to the President. A portion of it was made public; and a part of it was not made public, for the sake of security.

The Senator from Montana has referred to the establishment of the Joint

Committee on Atomic Energy as a precedent for the establishment of a new congressional joint committee on the CIA. Let me point out that there is an essential difference between the work of the Atomic Energy Commission and the work of the CIA. The Atomic Energy Commission is a manufacturing commission. It is the first agency of the Government, I believe, which actually is in the manufacturing business. It has continual activities which are subject to congressional consideration, in connection with proposals for legislative changes. The work of the Atomic Energy Commission is constantly changing. The Commission makes annual reports.

On the other hand, the CIA has made very few requests for legislation. As I have stated, it is an executive agency, similar to the Federal Bureau of Investigation or similar to the Department of Agriculture or the Department of the Interior or other executive departments. The CIA does not often have changes made by means of legislation in its fundamental structure.

So the work of Congress in supervising the CIA from a legislative point of view is essentially that of seeing that its funds are properly spent and that its activities are properly carried out in the way intended by Congress. As I have said, such supervision is now being conducted by a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee and a subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and is similarly conducted in the House of Representatives.

The Senator from Montana has referred to the functioning of the staff of the proposed joint committee. I do not see how such a staff could possibly conduct investigations of its own. I do not see how the members of such a staff would be able to investigate to any great degree the work of the CIA, for the simple reason that the necessary papers and the personnel with whom it would be essential to have discussions are within the National Security Council. Therefore, unless the matter under inquiry could be discussed openly, the staff members would not be able to obtain any information other than that which the Members of Congress now are able to obtain if they themselves request it.

In other words, the work of the CIA is essentially the work it does under the orders of the President and the National Security Council; and, as such, it must do that work. As I have said, I do not see how the staff members of the proposed joint committee could investigate the work of the CIA or could steer it into new and useful lines of endeavor.

Very briefly, those are the reasons why I oppose the establishment of a new committee. I happen to be a member of both subcommittees to which reference has been made. If the members of the subcommittees are not now doing their work properly, let them take the blame, and let new members be placed on those subcommittees.

On the Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee at present are the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New

Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and myself.

The members of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, of which subcommittee I was formerly chairman, are the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and, on the Republican side, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and myself.

We have gone into the subject to the degree we believe necessary to determine that the CIA is functioning properly. If we do not do our work, we should be the ones to be criticized, and we should be given suggestions as to what policies should be carried out.

For those reasons, briefly, I am opposed to the concurrent resolution. This is not a subject that can be discussed at length, because it is surrounded with security problems. I am opposed to the concurrent resolution which the Senator from Montana has submitted, although, as I say, I know that he is sincere, and I hope he accords me the same credit in opposing his resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts has a very high credit rating with me, I assure him.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate that statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted at the high level upon which the Senator has kept the discussion of the concurrent resolution.

Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the National Security Council is the chief policy-determining body of the Nation?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. For defense purposes. That is my understanding. I shall be glad to be corrected if I am mistaken. The President, as the head of the executive department, conducts foreign policy through the State Department. He conducts security policies through the Defense Department; and the CIA is an administrative agency which funnels to the National Security Council the information which the State Department, the Defense Department, and the CIA obtain in various parts of the world. The information comes to the National Security Council, where it can be used as a basis for the determination of the policies best fitted to promote our security. That is my understanding.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I now understand a little more clearly the question raised by the Senator from Massachusetts. The Senator says that if there is any fault, the members of the subcommittees are the ones who should be replaced. I assure the Senator that in my opinion the members of the various subcommittees are not the ones at fault. The concurrent resolution specifically provides that the membership of the new committee shall be composed of Senators and Representatives who at present are members of the CIA subcommittees in both the House and Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have nothing but the highest regard and esteem for all the Members who comprise the subcommittees, both Republicans and Democrats. All I am saying is that this activity should not be conducted on a subcommittee basis, but that a joint committee, with regular standing, should be appointed. It should have a small staff, so that an outlet could be furnished for the Congress, and the security and welfare of the CIA could be further insured.

From the remarks of the Senator, and from our personal conversations, I know that he understands my position on this question. I assure him that I understand his position, and have nothing but the highest regard for him.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The sentiment is mutual. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I had not intended to discuss Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 today. However, I believe the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts make it imperative that they be answered before the Senate adjourns today.

I think the Senator from Massachusetts knows that I hold him in exceptionally high regard. However, I have differed with him many times with regard to the administration of both military and foreign policies. In my judgment, our difference is very basic. As I see it, our difference is that I believe in putting to full and complete use our system of checks and balances. I have interpreted a great many of the positions of the Senator from Massachusetts, as I interpret his position today, as indicating what I consider to be an undue and unsound willingness to delegate to the executive branch of Government control which should always be vested in the people of the country through their elected representatives in the Congress. So I rise now to answer what I consider to be a complete fallacy of argument by false analogy used by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The Senator from Massachusetts compares the CIA with the FBI, and says that the procedure followed in regard to the FBI corresponds to the procedure followed in respect to the CIA. I deny it. I deny it because of the many checks which we exercise with respect to the FBI as a branch of the Department of Justice and do not exercise in respect to CIA. We are constantly checking the FBI. We check it with full disclosure in connection with appropriations. We check it with full disclosure in regard to the salaries paid by the FBI. We have neither such check on the CIA.

We check the FBI also in respect to its jurisdiction. We check it in respect to the authority we give it, and we check it—although not to the degree I think we should—even in respect to the type of files it maintains and the evidence it collects and the use to which it puts its files. We exercise some check on it even in respect to so-called secret information.

For some years past, in almost every session of Congress, we have gotten into a little difficulty with the FBI over the question whether or not the Congress, as

the legislative body of the people of the United States, shall have access to the information we think we are entitled to, when we consider there is a possibility of a wrong being done by the FBI. What happens then? I think the record is replete with instances of at least exercising a check upon the FBI to the extent that representatives of the FBI sit down with the chairmen of the committees concerned, and with the majority and minority representatives of such committees, and make available the material in their possession in connection with some alleged injustice. In such cases Congress has called for the FBI files so that they can be examined in order that we may determine whether or not we should impose further checks on the FBI.

Thus in the operation of the so-called FBI internal police system it is simply not true that we fail to exercise checks upon it, as has been contended by the Senator from Massachusetts this afternoon.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me say to the Senator from Oregon that I respect his sincerity in the position he takes.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I see it the checks on the FBI, through the chairmen of committees, or through the ranking members of committees, are the same checks that we exercise with respect to the CIA.

As I say, the information which we obtain as members of the subcommittee is available, so far as it can be made available consistent with security purposes, to Members of the Senate in open debate or in executive session. So I think the procedure is the same in that regard.

Mr. MORSE. There are many rebuttals I could make to the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Consider, for example, reports from the Committee on Appropriations. Compare the FBI reports with the CIA reports, as they relate to the Committee on Appropriations.

The FBI makes full public disclosure to the American people with regard to the amounts appropriated, and the uses to which they are put. That is not true with respect to the CIA. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Massachusetts may know something with respect to the CIA which I, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, do not know, and which the American people do not know. That is what I am protesting against. I see nothing about any Member of the United States Senate which should entitle him to any information which is denied to the entire membership of the Senate as representatives of the American people.

We are dealing with America's spy system when we are dealing with the CIA; and when we are dealing with America's spy system, we had better take care that we do not deal with a police state system. We do not have to fight communism with a police state system. We did not have to fight Nazism with a police state system. We had better keep

on free ground. We had better keep intact the system of checks provided by our form of government.

I wish to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that when he countenances and gives support to the kind of procedure which exists in the handling of CIA—and I say this most respectfully—he is supporting a form of American police state system. Never will my voice be raised in defense of it. I believe the manner in which the American spy system functions ought to be known by all the members of the Armed Services Committee and by all the members of the Foreign Relations Committee. We do not know it today. The Senator from Massachusetts stands on the floor of the Senate today and makes an argument in support of an exclusive system under which certain favorite ones are picked out and given certain secret information. That is not a system of checks and balances, I say most respectfully to the Senator from Massachusetts; it is government by selection.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As the Senator well knows, I would never support any kind of police state system. That is furthest from my mind. I am trying to support a system which is making an effort to obtain for us the necessary information on which to base our security policies. In doing that we are trying to protect the lives of men who are endeavoring to get the information for us. Those are brave men.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts would not support a system with the label "police state" pinned on it. I say to him again most respectfully that when he defends the present CIA system, he defends a spy system that is based upon a police state procedure. I say that because when such procedures keep away from elected officials of a free people and from the people themselves facts which are important to them, then they constitute, in my judgment, a police state procedure. I shall never support it.

I believe it is very important that we maintain a legislative check on the spy system our Government maintains around the world. I say that because if that spy system miscarries, if it is not based upon sound procedures, it can get us into a great deal of trouble.

I wish to say something about the argument the Senator is making, from the standpoint of security. During my 11 years in the Senate, whenever we try to discuss this subject, some Senator rises, as the Senator from Massachusetts has done, and argues that we have to do a certain thing in the interest of security. I say that is an unsound argument. I feel that America is most secure when there is a full public disclosure made to the elected representatives of the people of the facts about our foreign policy.

We cannot escape the fact that CIA has a great deal to do with forming the foreign policy of the United States. As it makes its report to the Secretary of State, as it makes its report to the

National Security Council, and as it makes its report indirectly to the President of the United States, it is bound to influence foreign policies.

That is why the Senator from Massachusetts has heard me say so many times—and I repeat it because it is a truth that must be drummed into the thinking of the American people—that our rights as free people are no better than our procedural rights.

We had better always look at the procedure we are defending. Let us forget labels for a minute. Let us forget all the talk about security. Let us, instead, ask what the procedure is that we countenance.

I say to the Senator from Massachusetts that under the procedure he countenances in regard to the CIA, there are being kept from the American people and their representatives in Congress facts which in my judgment they ought to know. They are facts which go into the formation of American foreign policy. I am worried about America's foreign policy.

If the Senator from Massachusetts wishes to know why I believe the Secretary of State stumbles so much, it is because we do not have sufficient check on him in regard to the policy he follows, which we discover only too late as a result of his stumbling.

I believe the pending concurrent resolution to be of great importance because it would give to the American people, through their representatives in the Congress a check on the activities of the CIA, for the resolution would establish a joint committee which would have as its primary and sole duty checking on the functions of the CIA.

I cast no reflection on the Senator from Massachusetts and on the other members of the subcommittee. However, I wish to say that his membership on the subcommittee is not the major job of the Senator from Massachusetts. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations I do not have any information which has ever been given to me by the Senator's subcommittee with respect to the so-called checks the Senator has made on the CIA. The Senator says that if we had asked him for information he would have always been willing to give it to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I happen to believe—and I say this most respectfully—that, if the Senator claims the subcommittee has been checking on the CIA, then the Senator should have been making reports right along, periodically, to the Committee on Foreign Relations. His subcommittee should have been submitting such reports. It should have been submitting such reports to the Committee on Armed Services and to the Committee on Appropriations. The three committees I have mentioned, the Armed Services, the Appropriations, and the Foreign Relations Committees, ought to be kept apprised of the subcommittee's findings and with respect to the information the subcommittee has gathered in regard to its so-called studies of CIA.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Then I shall not interrupt him any further.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have never personally—and I make this a personal matter because I do not wish to speak for anyone else—asked the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for any knowledge it may have obtained, either in private or open hearings, because I have always considered that those matters were of primary concern to that joint committee, and that they were handling the matter very well so far as I knew, and therefore I did not wish to have that kind of information given to me if it was not necessary for me to have it.

In the same spirit, we operate with the CIA. We discuss questions with them. If the Senator from Oregon were to ask me about certain information, I might be able to tell him, and tell him reasonably accurately. I have not done so in the past, because the Senator has not asked me. I believe also that he has not asked for such information of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, particularly information which that committee may have obtained in its investigations.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to make two observations with respect to what the Senator has commented on. First, I should like to say that there is a great difference in the thinking of the Senator from Massachusetts and myself. How do I know what information I ought to have in regard to CIA that is in the mind of the Senator from Massachusetts and the other members of his subcommittee if he does not volunteer it?

If he has been conducting, as a subcommittee of the Senate, an investigation or a study of the CIA, and acquires information which has a bearing upon American foreign policy, I believe it to be his duty to inform the Committee on Foreign Relations, and not to wait for us to pitch in the dark and say, at a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations, "I wonder whether the subcommittee has something in which we might be interested." I believe, in carrying out my duty as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I am entitled to that information.

I go back to the Saudi Arabian matter which I discussed earlier today. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I have been greatly concerned about what is going on in the Middle East. I believe we ought to have some information on it from the CIA. We ought to have some information as to what is going on in Saudi Arabia and in the other countries in the Middle East. The kind of joint committee that is called for in Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 will make that kind of information available to us. The joint resolution makes it the clear duty of the CIA to supply such information to us. The Senator's subcommittee has no such mandate from the Senate. I want a committee established that will have that kind of mandate. I want to have established a committee which will have as its duty periodically to report to the committees of the Senate the kind of information they can use.

I close by saying that what is represented in the debate today is a serious difference of opinion in the administration of our Government. Certainly a very dangerous trend has been developing in Government during the past quarter of a century. It is the trend toward Government by secrecy on the part of the executive branch of the Government. I want to know whether that trend is to continue, and whether, as the Senator from Massachusetts argues this afternoon, in the interest of security there is a body of information which ought to be kept secret from the elected representatives of the people.

I deny the premise. I say that under our constitutional system of checks and balances we must watch out for that kind of argument, because in my judgment such an argument indicates that dangerous shoals lie ahead, shoals which can easily wreck our whole ship of freedom which has been built up under our great Constitution.

As this debate proceeds on Wednesday, I think we will have the right to get the answers from the subcommittee to which the Senator from Massachusetts has referred, in regard to some of their findings. If they do not want to give them to us in open session, I think we have the right to get them in executive session, because, Mr. President, when we are dealing with the CIA, we are dealing with America's spy system; and the American people have a right to know what kind of spying we are doing and what kind of policy we have. A spy system, unless it is very rightly handled, can be a major cause of war.

I see that my junior colleague is on the floor, and I shall defer the suggestion of a quorum call, because I understand he wishes to address the Senate.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Oregon.

UPPER COLORADO PROJECT GAINS APPROVAL BUT HELLS CANYON PROJECT STILL IS DENIED AUTHORIZATION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, approval of the bill to authorize construction of the upper Colorado River storage project promises to become a new landmark in the history of the development of the arid West. The action reaffirmed the 50-year-old concept in the field of reclamation that the multiple-use functions of water resources should be dedicated to the material advancement of all the people within the drainage of a river basin.

I frankly admit that when upper Colorado River project legislation was introduced at this session of Congress, I had many reservations about its economic feasibility and its possible impact on national policy for protection of our national park system. During the course of debate I was especially impressed by the cogent arguments of the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] who serves with distinction as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the

Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. In my opinion, his speech on the coordinate elements of the project and their relationship to the future development of the Rocky Mountain region was an outstanding declaration of the purpose of irrigation in the arid plateaus of the West. The able Senator from New Mexico gave real meaning to the project's usefulness in enhancing the welfare of both the region and the Nation. I became convinced that the upper Colorado River project, although a relatively high-cost development, was justified because of what it will mean to the future advancement of a large segment of our Nation's land area.

FEDERAL POWER REVENUES AID IRRIGATION

The principle established in the upper Colorado River bill for use of power revenues to aid irrigation development is one which, transplanted to the Columbia River region, would provide thousands of new farming opportunities and convert to productive use a vast area of fertile but now arid land. Irrigation developments such as the Crooked River, Bully Creek, Pendleton, John Day, and many other projects in the State of Oregon will be dependent on the use of surplus power revenues for their eventual construction. This form of aid to irrigation is needed to meet the costs which are beyond the ability of water users to pay. It is justified because of the contribution which such development makes to our Nation's supply of food and fiber.

I also thought that the upper Colorado project set forth another principle which should be applied to my native region, the Columbia River Basin. The theory that the interrelated use of water requires a basin wide approach to planning of river-development projects was clearly enunciated in the upper Colorado bill. Unfortunately, the Columbia River Basin—with the greatest potential for beneficial use of all our Nation's waterways—has been subjected to more haphazard treatment. The once-great pattern for Columbia River development—the Army's 308 Report—has been decimated by policies advanced by the present administration. Partnership schemes, surrender of priceless damsites to partial development, and attempts to deauthorize Federal projects have resulted in the shrinking of the Northwest's possibilities for flood control, power, and irrigation development. Perhaps the concept represented by the upper Colorado project will help put back the Columbia River Basin development on the road to proper development.

PRIVATE POWER COMPANIES SHUN COLORADO POWER

I have joined in the approval of the upper Colorado project because the provision has been eliminated which would have drowned out Dinosaur National Monument, a feature which I thought would set a precedent for endangering our entire national park system. Also, I endorsed the belief of upper Colorado project supporters that the area's water resources were in urgent need of immediate development.

However, Mr. President, there are certain aspects of the approval of the proj-

ect which furnish a contrast that must be called to the attention of the American people.

While Congress has given approval to the upper Colorado project, it has denied approval to the Hells Canyon project. What does this mean? It means that, under this national administration, only those Federal water-resource projects evidently can gain authorization which have the sanction of the private-utility industry.

No private power company would think of undertaking development of the marginal, high-cost waterpower sites involved in the upper Colorado project. A very influential power company, the Idaho Power Co., covets the magnificent hydroelectric site at Hells Canyon, along the Snake River, on the Oregon-Idaho boundary.

Thus, the administration pushes the upper Colorado project, while simultaneously choking the Hells Canyon project.

Approval of the upper Colorado project—combined with denial of approval to the Hells Canyon project—sets the pattern for a program of letting the United States Treasury finance development of the dregs of our national waterpower sites, while the cream of these sites are given away to private utility corporations.

SEVEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SIX MILLION DOLLAR PROJECT IS APPROVED, THREE HUNDRED AND EIGHT MILLION DOLLAR PROJECT IS SCUTTLED

There is no other possible interpretation of this contrasting action in the case of the two projects. The sites in the Rocky Mountain area, where there is low and undependable stream flow, are reserved for Uncle Sam. The sites in the Pacific Northwest, where lurks 40 percent of all the untapped hydroelectricity in the United States, are bestowed upon the private utilities.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that, apparently, they are reserving those sites because the development of power at those sites would be so expensive that no private utility company would want to undertake their development?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is quite obvious. The sites which this administration is willing to set aside for public development are those which are so uneconomical, so unfeasible that no private utility company would think of risking its capital in trying to develop them.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that the sites which are being turned over to private utility companies under this administration are the sites which, under Government operation, could generate power at rates from 2.5 mills to 3.5 mills, whereas private utility companies at the same sites would generate and sell power at from 5 mills to 7 mills?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Even from 5 mills to 9 mills, I will say to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. MORSE. Has the Senator read in the newspapers that the present Secretary of the Interior says that he has never given anything away?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Evidently, he has never heard of Hells Canyon.

Mr. MORSE. Or, apparently he cannot figure the difference between 2.5 mill to 3.5 mill power and 5 mill power to 7 mill power. Every time he has been a party to making available to private utility companies great multiple-purpose dam sites of great value to the American people, and belonging to the American people, he has given away millions of dollars which, in the last analysis, belong to all the taxpayers of the country. Is not that true?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I think it is true.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not also true that the Secretary of the Interior, in effect, would give away the value of the high dam at Hells Canyon to private companies if they should succeed, in the last analysis, in defeating us in our fight to have the Government develop Hells Canyon?

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator is too generous in his description of the Secretary's action. Not only did the Secretary of the Interior intervene in the Hells Canyon fight, but he actually intervened on the side of the Idaho Power Co. He stated before the Chamber of Commerce that he believed the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River to be the finest water power site remaining on the North American continent.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator aware that the Secretary, in recent testimony before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report referred to the high Hells Canyon project as a white elephant? The testimony of the Secretary's own engineers before the Senate and House Interior Committees was very explicit that the Hells Canyon Dam is feasible, and the Army engineers have consistently supported the Hells Canyon dam site, as did General Itschner in regard to its flood-control benefits in recent testimony.

I asked General Itschner whether the Army Engineers still held the same opinion as to Hells Canyon Dam, and his answer was in the affirmative. Yet, now, the Secretary of the Interior has turned over, by way of recommendation, the Hells Canyon site, to the Idaho Power Co., a site containing many millions of dollars of value and belonging to all the people of the United States. Does the Senator agree with me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I not only agree totally, but, again, I think the Senator is somewhat too generous. When the Secretary of the Interior used the term "white elephant" to describe the Hells Canyon site he was using the identical language employed by the opponents of Grand Coulee approximately a quarter of a century ago. Yet, Grand Coulee, now in operation, is not only the greatest power producing project anywhere on the face of the earth, and not only has it resulted in thousands of farms where ex-GI's are profitably raising crops, but the Federal Columbia Basin system, including Grand Coulee, is \$65 million ahead of schedule in paying back into the Treasury of the United States the investment in its power facilities. Grand Coulee was called a "white elephant," just as the Secretary of the Interior refers to the proposed Hells Canyon high dam as a white elephant. I would say

it is a singularly inappropriate choice of language on his part.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to commend my colleague for the speech he is making this afternoon, and I shall make use of it in the months ahead.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am gratified that the Senator feels that it is of value to him.

Mr. President, speaking as a Senator from Oregon, I regard it as significant that the three Republican Members of Congress from my State, who have opposed Federal development of Hells Canyon, all voted for passage of the upper Colorado Federal project.

Mr. President, I believe in development of the Whole West. Occasionally that development requires high-cost and uneconomic projects of the type of the upper Colorado. This has been necessary before in arid and sparsely-settled regions. But, Mr. President, I would not be so inconsistent as to support this \$756 million project in the Rocky Mountains and yet abandon a \$308 million project, of greater economic worth and validity, on the frontiers of my own State.

Let us study some amazing facts, Mr. President.

Total cost of the three main upper Colorado Dams—Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, and Curecanti—is \$735,256,000. Of this sum \$469,715,000 has been assigned to be paid back out of power revenues. The average net annual output of these three principal upper Colorado dams is 3,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity.

Total cost of Hells Canyon high dam is \$308,500,000, of which \$270 million would be assigned to be reimbursed from power revenues. The annual average production of electricity at Hells Canyon would be slightly over 5 billion kilowatt-hours.

Thus, upper Colorado project dams will contain power facilities costing 74 percent more than the power facilities at Hells Canyon, but the upper Colorado plants will generate only 70 percent as much energy. Upper Colorado power, therefore, is about two and a half times more expensive than Hells Canyon power.

This comparison, Mr. President, strips all seven veils from the power program of the present Republican administration. It shows that the marginal and costly sites are reserved for Federal development. The magnificent and low-cost sites are given away on a platter to the private utilities. As we sit here in this Chamber authorizing the upper Colorado project, with its high-cost power, the Idaho Power Co. proceeds with preemption of the Hells Canyon hydroelectric site on the Snake River. The administration has backed upper Colorado, it has scuttled Hells Canyon. Skim milk for the public, whipped cream for the private power companies.

SKIM MILK FOR PUBLIC, WHIPPED CREAM FOR THE UTILITIES

Mr. President, this administration in the field of natural resources has turned back the clock half a century, to before the era of Teddy Roosevelt and Pinchot. Nowhere is that tragedy more gripingly emphasized than in the Federal authorization of the upper Colorado project

and the denial of Federal authorization to Hells Canyon. My region, the Pacific Northwest, is paying the penalty because its power sites are so valuable. Were the power sites in the Pacific Northwest low in flow and dubious in quality, like those in the upper Colorado Basin, we, too, would be sharing in Federal Government authorization today. We are penalized because our power sites are sterling in quality, and so the private utilities insist upon preempting them.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Partners in Plunder," written by me, and published in the Progressive for July 1955, and also an illuminating editorial entitled "Developing a River," published in the New York Times of March 3, 1956. I call special attention to that portion of the Times editorial which questions why the administration is prepared to build the costly upper Colorado project, but not the Hells Canyon project, "With greater promise of economic returns."

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTNERS IN PLUNDER

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER)

Conservatives in the United States sigh with relief these days, now that the Republican administration has stopped the creeping socialism of public-power projects on the great rivers of the Nation. The President even cites approvingly at press conferences a book entitled "Big Dam Foolishness," with the implication that no such foolishness will be tolerated while he resides at No. 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Liberals, conversely, are distressed over the fact that they evidently have seen the last of the great Federal dams as long as the present administration is in office.

Both groups happen to be substantially in error.

The Eisenhower administration is not opposed to public-power projects per se. It is only opposed to those projects which would be located at dependable low-cost sites, sure to pay off handsomely for the United States Treasury. At the same time the administration fervently favors public-power projects at locations where the energy will prove expensive and thus quite likely be a financial liability in decades to come. When historians begin pronouncing judgment on this administration, they are certain to be puzzled by a regime supposedly wedded to fiscal solvency but which, nonetheless, has insisted that the Government ought to develop only hydroelectric sites that promise scant possibility of achieving financial success.

This irony is symbolized by the administration's contrasting attitudes toward the Columbia and the Colorado Rivers.

The Columbia is the grandest stream for hydroelectricity on the continent, perhaps in the world. It carries down to the sea the snows and glaciers that melt all the way from Canada's distant Arctic divide to the Coast Range. The Columbia combines the hurtling gradient of a mountain brook with the massive volume of a Niagara; actually, greater than Niagara. Its flow is reliable and steady. The late J. D. Ross, first Administrator of Bonneville Dam, told me that the Columbia was a coal mine which would never thin out, an oil well that could never run dry. Furthermore, the Columbia's broad bosom is suitable for ocean commerce as far as The Dalles, safely inland of the backbone of the Cascades. In the Columbia and

its tributaries lurks 42 percent of the undeveloped waterpower of this entire Nation.

The Columbia River drains approximately 180 million acre-feet of water to the Pacific. The average flow of the Colorado, by comparison, amounts to merely 16,270,000 acre-feet, or less than 10 percent the drainage of the Columbia. In fact, even the Columbia's principal tributary, the Snake River, has a volume of 37 million acre-feet, which is more than double that of the Colorado. Within the surging reaches of the Columbia and its feeder streams a total of 31,369,000 kilowatts of power remains to be tapped. But undeveloped power in the basin of the Colorado totals only 5,056,000 kilowatts; this is about 16 percent of the residual strength of the Columbia.

On the Columbia River, where generating costs are low because of the Columbia's vast potential, the Eisenhower administration has decided that Federal dams would be ideologically and financially unwise. During the 1954 campaign Secretary of the Interior McKay cited the huge Federal debt as a compelling reason why further Government projects were unlikely in the Columbia Basin. Where was the money to come from? Yet this same administration, through the President and Secretary McKay, is advocating expenditures of \$1,659,000,000 for the upper Colorado power and storage project and an additional \$156,541,000 for the Fryngpan-Arkansas project in the Colorado area.

"With a \$275 million national debt," McKay told an Oregon audience last year, "Congress is not going to put as much money into Northwest power development as we need. We will have to attract risk capital for quickest development of the Northwest's power resources."

Magically, the national debt seemed to be cleared up by the time the Secretary's plane had flown 800 miles eastward to the intermountain region, where sluggish power sites are not coveted by private utilities. All at once, McKay discovered nearly \$2 billion in the straitened United States Treasury for unprofitable power development along the upper Colorado.

Why the ambivalence? Why are Federal dams creeping socialism and fiscally unsound in the Columbia Basin but good, solid Republican doctrine in the watershed of the Colorado?

The apparent explanation for the contrast does scant credit to the sincerity of the present national administration.

Power can be produced at Federal dams on the Columbia for as little as 2.1 mills a kilowatt-hour. This is cheaper than Niagara, cheaper than TVA, and barely more than one-third the cost of the 6-mile energy that will be generated at the projects which the Eisenhower regime favor on the upper Colorado. Industrial users are hungry for the low-cost power available from the mighty Columbia. They besiege the Government for more of it, thereby repudiating those private-utility propagandists who confidently predicted Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams would become "white elephants" after F. R. D. gave the go-ahead signal for construction 20 years ago.

In an effort to convince the Nation that new Federal projects should not be built in the Columbia Basin, Secretary McKay has referred to this energy as subsidized power. But he does not read the reports from his own bureau. The 1953 annual report of the Interior Department boasts that the repayment of the Federal investment in the Bonneville Power Administration "is substantially in excess of scheduled requirements." Indeed, the repayment was \$65 million ahead of schedule as of June 30, 1954. After only 11 years of full operation, Bonneville Dam is more than 35 percent paid for—principal, plus 2½ percent interest—through revenues to the Federal Treasury from the sale of power.

Paradoxically, this is the kind of dam which the Eisenhower administration no longer can afford to construct—because of the crushing burden of the national debt. Yet this same administration, which shuns profitable dams, is eager to undertake unprofitable dams. Not even Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey has explained how such a policy can possibly have a favorable impact on the fiscal standing of the Government.

Hells Canyon on the Snake River, an awesome gorge over a dizzy mile in depth, is the finest natural hydroelectric power site left in North America. The administration plans to surrender this site to the Idaho Power Co., an absentee-dominated corporation which charges the highest rates of any major company in the Northwest. At recent hearings held in Oregon and Idaho by the Senate Interior Committee, prominent Republicans denounced a bill (S. 1333) for a Federal dam at Hells Canyon as creeping socialism and a threat to our American way of life.

II

No such tirades are directed against the Glen Canyon and Echo Park Dams which the Republican administration is promoting as part of the upper Colorado project, in spite of the fact that the Echo Park unit would breach the National Park system with a commercial development for the first time in history.

Here are the comparative economics of Hells Canyon and the combined dams at Glen Canyon and Echo Park:

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Hells Canyon: | |
| Cost | \$357,000,000 |
| Power production (kilowatt-hours) | 5,504,000,000 |
| Glen Canyon and Echo Park: | |
| Cost | \$597,696,000 |
| Power production (kilowatt-hours) | 4,830,000,000 |

Thus, Glen Canyon and Echo Park will cost 67 percent more to construct than Hells Canyon but will generate 14 percent less waterpower.

In my opinion, this ironical situation strips clear down to the seventh veil the administration's pious protestations about "creeping socialism" and fiscal solvency. If a Federal dam on the Columbia River or Snake River is ideologically perilous, what mysterious alchemy makes a Federal dam on the upper Colorado River politically pristine?

The actual reason for not constructing Federal dams in the Columbia Basin today is that private utilities crave these magnificent sites where kilowatts can be produced so cheaply. No power company with management capable of passing a sanity test would think of investing stockholders' funds in concrete poured into the unprofitable and marginal locations along the upper Colorado. In essence, it is a policy of turning over the cream of hydroelectric sites to the power companies and leaving the skim milk for the public.

I am one of those who believes the upper Colorado project (minus Echo Park) should be undertaken by the Government, regardless of the fact it may never pay out. The settlement of the intermountain West probably demands such a capital investment by the rest of the Nation. After all, countless millions have been poured into Mississippi levees and harbor dredging at Chesapeake Bay and New York's East River with no suggestion that direct returns to the Treasury must result. But in my view, it is little short of criminal for the administration to promote Federal responsibility for the arid and extravagant sites on the upper Colorado while it simultaneously disseminates propaganda about creeping socialism and subsidized power to justify Federal abandonment of the great power sites along the Columbia River and kindred streams.

III

At Glen Canyon Dam, construction costs will total \$463 for each kilowatt of generating capacity. At Echo Park Dam, which threatens to scar the scenic grandeur of the Dinosaur National Monument, costs will be still higher—\$640 per kilowatt. Contrast these figures with the construction sums for two major Federal dams in the Columbia River Basin: \$115 per kilowatt at Bonneville, \$90 at Grand Coulee. Yet Bonneville and Grand Coulee are the kind of sites which the administration wants to surrender to private power companies.

The surrender takes two separate forms: (1) outright relinquishment, as at Hells Canyon, where the hydroelectric site will be turned over to a utility corporation, and (2) a partnership operation between the Government and power companies, such as the administration advocates at John Day and other sites in the lower reaches of the Columbia Basin.

Partnership is an intriguing gimmick. The Government pays for the deadweight part of a dam, such as fish ladders, flood gates, and navigation locks. A syndicate of utility companies finances the powerhouse and installs the generation equipment. In return, the companies get a monopoly on the dam's power production for half a century. Of course, this completely circumvents the public-power preference clause, which until now has reserved first call on Columbia River energy for farmers' rural electric cooperatives and similar nonprofit agencies. Theodore Roosevelt first conceived the preference clause, in the Reclamation Act of 1906.

Last year Secretary McKay approved a bill that would have given utility companies a 50-year stranglehold on the John Day site in return for a contribution of \$164 million toward construction of the dam. Protests by public-power groups, under the leadership of Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, of Oregon, prevented the bill from passing. Now, McKay is backing a new John Day bill increasing the private-utility offer to \$273 million—a tacit acknowledgment by him that the 1954 version would have denied the public purse at least \$109 million which was its due.

Yet, even with a partnership contribution of \$273 million, the abandonment of the John Day power facilities for half a century would be one of the greatest bargains since Manhattan Island was traded off for \$24. The Corps of Army Engineers estimates that annual power benefits creditable to John Day Dam will amount to \$25,538,000. Over a period of 50 years this would total \$1,276,900,000 before company profits are added; a tidy return on the utility's original investment.

From the standpoint of people directly affected—citizens of Oregon and Washington—perhaps the worst feature of the Eisenhower partnership is its adverse economic impact. In my home State of Oregon, the successful Federal power program increased farm electrification from 27 percent to 98 percent. It brought about the only period in Northwest history when our gains in industrial payrolls, from 1939 to 1948, exceeded the national average.

Partnership would return high-cost power to the Pacific Northwest. Private power companies must pay higher interest rates on their borrowings than the Federal Government and a reasonable rate of return to stockholders. Also, partnership projects would be isolated plants outside the Columbia power system and would not benefit by having costs averaged in with low Bonneville and Grand Coulee rates.

These two factors alone would raise the cost of power to consumers. For the Pacific Northwest partnership means higher power rates, less industry, and fewer jobs.

IV

When Theodore Roosevelt occupied the White House, the Rivers and Harbors Board

of the Engineers Corps made this recommendation after a partnership had been proposed between the Government and a power company to develop the Tennessee River: "In general, any partnership relation between the United States and a private corporation is necessarily to be closely scrutinized as the results in the past have been that the Government as party to such agreements usually suffered thereby."

The partnership fostered by the Eisenhower administration classically fits this warning. The public relinquishes to private utilities such majestic sites as Hells Canyon, but the public pays to harness such marginal sites as those in the upper Colorado. At sites earmarked for partnership development, the public gets the watery staircases for migrating salmon and the gates to hold back floods. Utilities get 50-year monopolistic leases on the powerhouses—powerhouses like Bonneville, which have put a gross sum of more than \$350 million in the United States Treasury since Federal power sales began on the Columbia and its tributaries.

In fact, the partnership between the American people and the private power companies proposed by President Eisenhower and Secretary of the Interior McKay follows generally the lines of the immortal partnership between the Owl and the Panther described by Lewis Carroll:

"I passed by his garden and marked, with one eye,
How the Owl and the Panther were sharing a pie;
The Panther took piecrust, and gravy, and meat,
While the Owl had the dish as his share of the treat."

[From the New York Times of March 3, 1956]

DEVELOPING A RIVER

House passage of the \$756 million bill to harness, store, and use the waters of the upper Colorado makes it virtually certain that this gigantic power and irrigation project will soon be enacted into law.

The President has enthusiastically endorsed the plan in principle and the Senate has passed an even more expensive version of its own. The major—though not the only—difference between Senate and House bills is that the former includes and the latter excludes the highly controversial Echo Park Dam, on which the President showed himself to be misinformed at his press conference Wednesday when he stated that it was fear of damage to wildlife that had aroused hostility to Echo Park Dam. Wildlife had nothing to do with it. The Nation's conservationists were united in their opposition, and with such effect that the entire Colorado project would have died in the House had Echo Park been left in the bill, because this dam would have constituted a direct and unnecessary incursion into the national park system. In addition, the dam would have seriously damaged some of the finest canyon scenery in the West.

The measure as a whole, in both Senate and House versions, provide basically for several major works on the upper Colorado, one of the most important of which would be the enormous Glen Canyon Dam, a large power producer. This and other projects would store water precious to the region, and would provide for the initial irrigation of more than 100,000 acres of land and supplemental irrigation of over 200,000. The project marks the real beginning, for the upper basin States of Utah, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Colorado, of enjoyment of the benefits of that portion of the flow of the Colorado River allocated to them in an interstate compact of 1922. It would undoubtedly be of great economic, industrial, and agricultural advantage to the upper basin States.

Whether or not the project is worth the cost is a matter of dispute between such

ardent proponents as Senator WATKINS, of Utah, and such able critics as Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois. While we have serious reservations regarding many features of this project, especially the economics of its irrigation and reclamation plans, we think there is no question but that the basic principle of comprehensive, multipurpose development represents the proper approach of exploiting the actual and potential resources of a vast river system. While the actual mechanics must necessarily vary with the specific problems of each region—whether it be the Tennessee, the Missouri, or the Colorado—the basic idea of integrated river-valley planning seems inescapably logical, practical, and desirable. As a matter of fact, one of the criticisms of the pending project is that not all of its component parts have yet been sufficiently studied. Furthermore, there are political hazards that this or any comparable scheme must run, including the insertion of economically doubtful projects in order to get votes. But the principle remains valid that a flowing river should be tackled as a unit, as something greater and more challenging than the mere sum of a large number of isolated and localized parts.

If a stream such as the Colorado is going to be developed with dams, storage reservoirs, powerplants, irrigation projects, and other facilities, it has to be developed with the financial resources of the Federal Government. This the present administration is fully prepared to do at Glen Canyon in the Colorado Basin but not at Hell's Canyon in the Columbia Basin. Of course, the two situations are not identical; but it would seem to us that from the point of view of long-term, regional, comprehensive planning, a high Federal dam in Hell's Canyon makes just as much sense—and with greater promise of economic returns—as a high Federal dam in the upper basin of the Colorado.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very illuminating letter published in the Coos Bay (Oreg.) Times of March 12, 1956. The author of the letter is Howard Morgan, a former member of our State legislature and now the State chairman of the Democratic Party in the State of Oregon. Mr. Morgan asks a very cogent question. He wants to know why the three Republican Members of the House of Representatives from Oregon voted to pass the costly upper Colorado River project, but are opposing the Hells Canyon project on the borders of Oregon.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Coos Bay (Oreg.) Times of March 12, 1956]

CONGRESSMEN FOR POWER IN COLORADO, NOT HERE

EDITOR:

Something new has been added to the power controversy and it raises some important questions.

As we all know, Republican Congressmen NORBLAD, COON, and ELLSWORTH have spent the last 3 years parroting the private power line that the Federal Government has stopped building power dams. The record clearly demonstrates that these men have dragged their feet on every authorization or appropriation bill for Federal dams in Oregon and the Northwest.

They offered no help to Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER and Congresswoman GREEN in last year's successful Democratic fight for three new starts on Federal dams in the Northwest. In fact they tried and are still trying to deauthorize every Federal power project so the private power companies, after

endless delays, can try to get authorization for gravy-train partnership deals.

VOTE FOR COLORADO

But on March 1, 1956 NORBLAD, COON, and ELLSWORTH voted for the enormous all-Federal power project on the upper Colorado River system when the bill passed in the House, 256 to 136. Let's see how this vote stacks up against the pious statements of our 3 Republican Representatives.

They say the Government won't build dams. If so, how did the bill sail through the House with a 120 vote margin? I predict it will pass the Senate with equal ease.

They say the high Federal dam at Hells Canyon, for example, costs too much money and we have to balance the budget. But power facilities at Hells Canyon would only cost \$270 million while the upper Colorado power facilities will cost \$470 million.

Do our Republican statesmen figure Hells Canyon can't produce enough power? It can produce 5 billion kilowatt-hours per year, compared to 3½ billion from the upper Colorado.

POWER COSTS MORE

Get that, please. Hells Canyon power facilities would cost 43 percent less and produce 42 percent more power than the upper Colorado, yet NORBLAD's, COON's, and ELLSWORTH's votes went to the upper Colorado. Where is that hard-headed Republican business sense we've heard so much about?

Do the people of Oregon agree with their Republican Representatives that high-cost power in the Rocky Mountains is a better public investment than low-cost power here at home?

I am not attacking the merits of the upper Colorado project. The people in that area need power and they need water. The upper Colorado project is their best hope of getting either, and the project is undoubtedly worth what it is going to cost. It is soundly engineered and no Member of Congress need apologize for voting in its favor.

ENTITLED TO KNOW

However, the people of Oregon are entitled to know why their Republican Representatives are willing to vote for high-cost Federal power projects a thousand miles from home but are absolutely unwilling to vote for low-cost Federal power projects right here on the boundary and even inside the State of Oregon.

This sort of behavior is not the simple-minded, country-bumpkin type of four-flushing it might appear to be. This is four-flushing with a vengeance and with a purpose. If these men can think up a single, sensible reason for their behavior they ought to do it now and it ought to be good.

HOWARD MORGAN,

State Chairman, Democratic Party.

DANGER IN NEW OREGON VOTING LAWS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter written by State Senator Monroe Sweetland, of Milwaukee, Oreg., and published in the Portland Oregonian of February 25, 1956. Senator Sweetland is Democratic national committeeman for the State of Oregon. It seems to me that his letter sets forth very clearly and effectively the danger in new Oregon voting laws which would restrict the right of franchise in our State. Voting is the culminating act in a democracy, as Woodrow Wilson once said. In my opinion, Mr. Sweetland's letter demonstrates how the Republican Party, which controls the Oregon State Legislature, has made an effort to re-

strict the number of persons who will vote in Oregon in future elections. This is not in keeping with the traditions or aims of our great democracy.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregonian of February 25, 1956]

NEW VOTING LAW CRITICIZED

TO THE EDITOR:

On February 20 you published a letter from Mrs. Jean K. Young, a top official of the Republican Party, defending and explaining the new voting restrictions under which Oregonians will cast ballots this year.

There is no hint in Mrs. Young's letter, written with an air of injured innocence, of how drastic and dangerous the new law is. These changes were fought bitterly by the helpless Democratic minority in the legislature, but Mrs. Young herself masterminded the new law and cracked the whip of discipline over those Republicans at Salem whose uneasy consciences would otherwise have led them to oppose these bushwhacking, partisan amendments.

If our Republic is founded on "consent of the governed," it is the duty of our States to make as simple and easy as possible the accurate recording of that consent. After Senator NEUBERGER's close victory in 1954, Mrs. Young's little coterie carefully laid their plans to rig Oregon's voting laws with gimmicks to make voting and registration more difficult and dangerous for certain groups of citizens who usually vote Democratic.

Mrs. Young's letter brushes off the new poll book signing law as trivial. Actually, to compel each voter to sign the books twice will approximately double the time now required to cast ballots. One of the great discouragements to voting in Oregon already is the jam at the polls in the big precincts in presidential years. In precincts populated with business and industrial employees (that is, Democratic precincts), the big jam comes between 5 and 8 p. m., when working people return home. Many more thousands will be utterly discouraged under this clumsy new system, and it will cost thousands of Oregonians their votes next fall.

Mrs. Young omitted from her letter any reference to the two most grave assaults on the right to vote.

She skimmed over the fact that the new law has set a trap to try to snare tens of thousands of voters who have kept a permanent address at a property they may own, or a former home, or the residence of a relative. These are mostly construction workers, teachers, loggers, farmworkers, and salesmen, who come back every 2 years to vote. They vote only once. There is no fraud. They seek only, as good citizens, to cast their one ballot. Because Mrs. Young's group knew these people mostly vote Democratic, the law has been rewritten to impose terrific penalties for voting in your home precinct instead of where you are at the moment staying. Many may be intimidated by this, as the Young group hopes.

Then there is the revision of the voters' registration cards, another effort at entrapment and discouragement of voting.

The new law puts on every voter's registration card a dire warning of 2 years imprisonment and \$5,000 fine for "any false statements" on this card. Heretofore the voter was held responsible only for any false statements on the card "as to my qualifications as an elector," and many blanks on the card were not essential to his voting. Nonessential information now required to be sworn to include such as place of birth, spouse's full name, parents' full names, and—note this—the "section, township, and range" of all who reside outside numbered-street areas.

We are stuck with this law until the 1957 legislature. This outrage against American democracy is all the more shocking because Oregon already has the worst voting record of any Western or Northern State, with one-third of our eligible adults not voting. We should be making registration and voting more convenient and simple, not more difficult and dangerous.

MONROE SWEETLAND,
State Senator, Clackamas County.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1834. An act to authorize certain retired commissioned officers of the Coast Guard to use the commissioned grade authorized them by the law under which they retired, in the computation of their retired pay under the provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended;

S. 2438. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever; and

S. 3269. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8107) to amend the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 47) withdrawing suspension of deportation of Benito Quintana Seara.

ADOPTION BY WEST COAST LUMBERMEN'S ASSOCIATION OF NEW GRADING RULES FOR LUMBER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call to the attention of my colleagues a significant change which occurred on March 15 in the western lumber industry. The West Coast Lumbermen's Association has adopted new grading rules for lumber shaped for the buyer and the consumer. For many years the standard construction grades of lumber were designated as No. 1, No. 2, No. 3, and No. 4. These did not mean a thing to the consumer, and as a matter of fact he often had the feeling that unless he got No. 1 he was not getting good lumber.

For several years in the West this problem has been under serious study because our lumber industry desires to sell a product which will satisfy the consumer from every standpoint. These lumber grades have been redesignated so that the consumer will have a better idea of exactly what he is getting. The new designations are now construction, standard, utility, and economy. These changes will enable the retail lumberman and the consumer to understand exactly what they are getting. Further, I think it will increase the amount of graded lumber on the market.

The production of lumber has been constantly climbing, and more and more of the tree is being used to manufacture a product which serves all types of consumers. I wish to insert in the RECORD the statement of the West Coast Lumbermen's Association regarding these new grading rules. In so doing, I call attention to some of the increases in the quality of the product under the new grades and the standardization of thicknesses and widths of boards and finished items.

This is a great forward step in sound merchandising, one which will help to keep all segments of the lumber industry healthy. It shows the recognition of a need and a willingness to make changes.

I should like to comment for a moment on the need for many changes in the way in which Federal agencies such as the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, sell their stumpage. An increasing number of western lumber companies depend upon Federal timber to manufacture lumber and other forest products. I think there is plenty of room for improvements in their merchandising starts in the woods. In order standardization in their dealings with the many companies buying their timber for manufacture into lumber.

I think it is axiomatic that good merchandising starts in the woods. In order to be able to satisfy the consumer and to develop outlets for all the things which can be manufactured from a log, the sawmill needs a good analysis of the quality of the raw material. With this the mill will better know what can be manufactured and how best to fill the market with a desired product. I should like to see the Federal agencies develop new merchandising techniques for stumpage to a far greater extent than is being done today. It would be a great boon to proper utilization of our timber.

I reiterate that these new lumber grades, construction, standard, utility, and economy, represent a great advance in providing the American consumer with lumber merchandised to fill their needs.

When the retail yard owner or the consumer asks for grade stumped lumber he is helping himself. The new grades tell them what the lumber they are buying will do for them. When the consumer buys lumber in the proper grade he needs for the job, he profits by getting exactly what he needs at the best price.

We all can make a contribution toward conservation by using our lumber wisely. When the consumer demands clear boards 1 inch by 12 inches by 16 feet long to saw up into 1-inch-by-3-inch material 4 feet long, he is paying a premium for that wide clear board, which is in relatively short supply and is proportionately higher in price. Very often he can buy a utility or economy grade board and get just as usable short boards at a much lower price. He helps himself by showing an interest in a budget-priced product. He creates a market for a product suited to his needs, and one which if not marketed represents a cost to the consumer anyway. If he demands and buys only clear lumber, he forces

up the price of that quality. Besides, the mill must tack on to its premium material the cost of handling, storing, and disposing of the other material which does not readily flow to the market, but which is a natural and sizable product in the manufacture of the log.

Lumber is one of our best building materials. If we use it wisely, we will always have an abundance to use freely. The four new grades, construction, standard, utility, and economy, and the story they tell, are a contribution by the western lumber industry to conservation and an abundance of supply.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published at this point in my remarks a statement entitled "New West Coast Grading Rules," written by H. V. Simpson, executive vice president, West Coast Lumbermen's Association, and published by the West Coast Lumbermen's Association.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW WEST-COAST GRADING RULES

(By H. V. Simpson)

Beginning March 15, 1956, west-coast lumber will be graded under a new rule—rule No. 15.

The change from rule No. 14 is profound in only one respect. An attempt has been made to write a rule which the purchaser of lumber can readily understand. It is not a technical document decipherable only by professional graders.

The actual change in the grades themselves is minor. You can expect to get in each grade just about what you have been getting in the past. We have made some refinements, of course, which we feel will improve the marketability of the product. More about these in a moment.

The principal and basic change is a change from grade numbers to grade names. But it is not nearly as complicated as it sounds. There are only four things to remember:

No. 1 becomes Construction.

No. 2 becomes Standard.

No. 3 becomes Utility.

No. 4 becomes Economy.

It is reasonable to ask, since the change is so slight, why bother at all?

Because we believe we can no longer continue practices which make the merchandising of lumber less orderly and less responsible than the merchandising of other building products. Let me quickly say that the irresponsible merchandiser is only a fractional minority. Most lumbermen choose to and do sell the grades they buy. But even they are hampered by the reluctance of the consumer to purchase a third-grade product for a home which he visualizes as first grade in every respect.

It is the numbers which cause the trouble.

The demand for grade stamping is steadily increasing. The demand is coming from retail dealers, Government agencies, builders, and many others.

A number of areas have already refused to accept anything but grade-stamped lumber. Several others are considering a similar prohibition. This trend has the endorsement of west-coast lumber manufacturers. We merely feel that a useful product should not be penalized because it is identified by a number.

Thirty years ago the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association adopted a resolution supporting universal grade stamping. The Southern Pine Association and the West Coast Lumbermen's Association have gone similarly on record. But every effort during the past 30 years to substantially extend the

grade stamping of lumber has failed because the public would not accept No. 2 or No. 3 or No. 4.

The NLMA, American Lumber Standards, WCLA's board of directors, the FHA all say, "Let's grade stamp the lumber." Today the tide of demand is stronger than it has ever been before. And this time—with names instead of numbers to sell—every advocate of responsible lumber merchandising has a chance to make it work.

The change to names applies only to the present No. 1, No. 2, No. 3, and No. 4 grades of boards and 2-inch and thicker dimension planks and timber. Select Merchantable remains the top grade in boards and Select Structural the top grade in dimension.

The lettering system—"B&Btr.," "C," and "D"—remains in effect on finish, flooring, casing, and other clear items. The only change in this category is that "C&Btr." becomes the top grade of flat-grain clears. This, of course, is merely in line with current practice. Vertical-grain clears continue to be designated "B&Btr.," "C," and "D."

The name of the bureau has been changed to West Coast Lumber Inspection Bureau, which is somewhat less cumbersome than West Coast Bureau of Lumber Grades and Inspection.

The format of rule No. 15 has been changed. We have tried to make it more readable and more understandable. Key paragraphs should be easier to find and easier to remember.

The fiber stress value of the present 1450f grade (No. 1) has been increased to 1500f and the fiber stress value of the 1100f grade (No. 2) has been increased to 1200f. In both cases the quality of the product has been improved.

The old rules permitted a full-length skip in No. 2 dimension, which probably caused more difficulty than any other single provision in the rules. FHA, for instance, regarded a full-length skip an intentional scant sawing.

The universal feeling of the industry was that this situation should be cleaned up and that as a matter of good merchandising it should be handled at the manufacturing end. Consequently, rule No. 15 provides that Standard (the old No. 2) may have hit-and-miss skips on the edge, but may not be skipped full length.

The Standard joists and planks grade (2 by 6 and wider) becomes a little better all around, as a matter of fact. As was mentioned a moment ago, the fiber stress value has been upped from 1100f to 1200f. And a medium-grain requirement has been included.

The thickness of boards and finish items has been reduced from $\frac{3}{32}$ -inch to $\frac{1}{4}$ -inch. Fifty percent of such material is $\frac{1}{4}$ -inch at the present time. There is more value in $\frac{3}{32}$ -inch material than is needed. The official change merely recognizes current practice. Those who wish to buy $\frac{3}{32}$ -inch boards may still buy them, of course, and have them grade stamped.

Rule No. 15 will have a standard provision on material 6 inches in width— $5\frac{1}{2}$ -inch instead of 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch as at present. This applies already in the larger sizes—7 $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch, 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch, 11 $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch. The new provision simply makes the practice uniform. It is, of course, in accordance with American Lumber Standards.

There are numerous other changes of lesser importance, but little or nothing to make the lumber you specify and receive under rule No. 15 much different in appearance than the lumber you have been specifying and receiving under the old rules.

In some cases knot sizes have been tightened, in other cases the restrictions on wane or splits have been somewhat eased. Wherever improvements could reasonably be made, they have been made. More than 2 years

of the most sincere and painstaking consideration has gone into the development of rule No. 15.

It is, for the first time, a grading rule shaped for the buyer and consumer of lumber rather than the professional grader.

It will, we hope, usher in four words which will long be useful to the retail lumber dealer—Construction, Standard, Utility, and Economy.

Again, the effective date of the new rules will be March 15, 1956, and copies of rule No. 15 will be mailed to all segments of the industry.

RECESS TO 11 A. M. WEDNESDAY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until Wednesday at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Wednesday, April 11, 1956, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 9, 1956:

DIPLMATIC SERVICE

Kenneth A. Byrns, of Colorado, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 1, consuls, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Rollin S. Atwood, of Maryland.

Winthrop G. Brown, of Virginia.

Henry J. Tasca, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Julius Bassin, of New York.

Ben H. Brown, Jr., of South Carolina.

Leon Crutcher, of Texas.

Charles L. Hodge, of Virginia.

Daniel L. Horowitz, of New Jersey.

Fisher Howe, of Illinois.

Boris H. Klosson, of Maryland.

Jesse M. MacKnight, of Maryland.

Frederick T. Merrill, of the District of Columbia.

George H. Steuart, Jr., of Virginia.

Ides van der Gracht, of New York.

Roswell H. Whitman, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Anthony J. Cefaratti, of Illinois.

Otho T. Colclough, of North Carolina.

Leonard Felsenthal, of the District of Columbia.

Leo M. Goodman, of New York.

Michael G. Kelakos, of Massachusetts.

Richard J. Kerry, of the District of Columbia.

Edward S. Little, of Ohio.

Walter Q. Loehr, of California.

Edwin L. Smith, of Arkansas.

Howard F. Smith, of Michigan.

Jay A. Van Swearingen, of Ohio.

Alberto M. Vázquez, of Virginia.

Jack S. Williams, of the District of Columbia.

Miss Marion W. Worthing, of Maryland.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Herbert W. Baker, of Montana.
John R. Barrow, of California.
Miss Elizabeth Ann Brown, of Oregon.
Phillip B. Dahl, of Illinois.
Robert C. Davis, of Florida.
Frank J. T. Ellis, of Ohio.
Charles B. Ferguson, of Indiana.
Millard L. Gallop, of Virginia.
Edwin J. Garrity, of Virginia.
Loren L. Goldman, of Maryland.
Chester H. Kimrey, of Oklahoma.
James L. Lee, of California.
Francis C. Prescott, of Maine.
Stanley J. Priske, of Pennsylvania.
Mrs. Montana W. Zbinden, of California.

Charles E. Paine, of California, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

Roy O. Carlson, of Illinois, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 6 to class 5.

Miss Norah H. Alsterlund, of Illinois, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 5, a consul, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Forest E. Abbuhl, of Ohio.
John W. Anderson, of Texas.
Charles White Bass, of Tennessee.
George R. Bingham, of Florida.
Miss Eleanor Glover Bond, of Florida.
Miss Eleanor R. Borrowdale, of California.
Miss Marie C. Chabot, of Rhode Island.
Philip R. Cook, Jr., of Virginia.
William E. Culbert, of Connecticut.
Rudolph Days, of Maryland.
N. Hunt Heubeck, of Florida.
Andrew John Kauffman II, of Maine.
Miss Marcia N. Lindgren, of California.
Edward S. McClary, of California.
Franklin L. Mewshaw, of New York.
Miss Gertrude M. Meyers, of Minnesota.
H. Miller Elliott, of Pennsylvania.
Lawrence J. Moran, of Massachusetts.
Laurent E. Morin, of New Hampshire.
Miss Janice Plowman, of Missouri.
Kenneth F. Rose, of Florida.
John L. Smith, of Wisconsin.
Miss Bernadine Whitfield, of Oregon.
Jean E. Zimmermann, of Missouri.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Brady G. Barr, of the District of Columbia.
Wesley D. Boles, of California.
Marshall Brement, of Maryland.
Hugh K. Campbell, of Ohio.
Willard A. De Pree, of Michigan.
Richard W. Dye, of New York.
Harold T. Ellis, of California.
Charles E. Exum III, of North Carolina.
Robert Earl Gordon, of Oregon.
Robert W. Huddleston, of New Jersey.
Joseph P. Leahy, of the District of Columbia.
Louis J. Link, of Kansas.
J. Thomas McAndrew, of New York.
W. Wyatt Martin, Jr., of Tennessee.
Robert W. Maule, of Minnesota.
Robert H. Munn, of California.
James C. Nelson, of Illinois.
Robert L. Nelson, of the District of Columbia.
James D. Rosenthal, of California.
Charles E. Rushing, of Illinois.

John D. Scanlan, of Minnesota.
James R. Wachob, of Oregon.
Richard L. Williams, of Indiana.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Walter L. Campbell, of Connecticut.
James C. Flint, of Ohio.
William A. Krauss, of California.
Francis J. McArdle, of New York.
Richard M. McCarthy, of Iowa.
William H. J. McIntyre, of Pennsylvania.
Allan Nelson, of California.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Daniel P. Oleksiw, of Pennsylvania.
Martin M. Tank, of Wisconsin.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Frank Ahmed, of Massachusetts.
David H. Cohn, of Florida.
Joseph R. Johnson, of Virginia.
Burton S. Miller, of Connecticut.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Warren Weaver, of Connecticut, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for the remainder of the term expiring May 10, 1960, vice James Bernard Macelwane, deceased.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Floyd Sherman Bryant, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Franklin G. Floete, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

George Cochran Doub, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Warren E. Burger, resigning.

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

Thomas Edward Stakem, Jr., of Virginia, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1958, vice G. Joseph Minetti.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

James R. Duncan, of Virginia, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 9, 1959, vice Kathryn McHale, term expired.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Ralph Kennamer, of Alabama, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Alabama for a term of 4 years, vice Percy C. Fountain, deceased.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Robert George Butler, O17191, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Louis Edward Cotulla, O29069, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. David Haytor Buchanan, O17746, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Eugene Fodrea Cardwell, O38662, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Louis Theilmann Heath, O18060, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. David William Helman, O17094, United States Army.

Col. Eric Hilmer Frithiof Svensson, O17630, United States Army.

Col. Thad Adolphus Broom, O18246, United States Army.

Col. William Frederick Cassidy, O18354, United States Army.

Col. Milton Leonard Ogden, O18687, United States Army.

Col. Charles Henry Chase, O19095, United States Army.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), Public Law 759, 80th Congress, and Public Law 36, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress:

To be major

Mordecai, Lindley R., MC, O1718112.

To be captain

Bridge, Carl J., MC, O1861678.

To be first lieutenants

Belleville, Helen E., ANC, N901757.
Caldwell, William L., MC, O4050745.
Clarke, Robert B., JAGC, O4017173.
Fenstermacher, James M., MC, O2268939.
Laubham, James J., Jr., DC, O2275651.
Mansfield, John O., MC, O4016515.
McCaffrey, Joseph P., MSC, O2049015.
Montgomery, Roena, ANC, N794859.
Staples, Jack E., MC, O2205819.
York, Germaine, ANC, N758821.

To be second lieutenant

Wilson, Shannon D., ANC, N901478.

The following named officer for appointment, by transfer in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade specified.

To be captain

Rouillard, Irving G., O281777.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to completion of internship:

Brandt, Fred A., O2275375.
Collie, Lamar P., Jr., O2275374.
Davies, Olwyn K., O2275572.
Fagerstrom, Charles D., O2275393.
Groth, Robert C., O2275559.
Haller, Yoel I.
Hartenstein, Paul E., O2275420.
Jacobs, Robert D.
Kuxhausen, Donald L., O2275415.
Lagace, Maurice N.
Lopiano, Michael A., O2275372.
Miale, August, Jr.
Plaut, Samuel M., O2275597.
Sample, Donald W.
Smith, Neilson, A., O2275352.
Walker, Donald D., O2275456.
Weissbein, A. Sigmund.

The following-named person for appointment in the Dental Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), upon receipt of doctor of dental surgery degree:

Kelly, James J., O2276573.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Gwaltney, Robert L.
Kuhns, Craig S., O2210734.
Maurer, William W., O2268174.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade

of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Edwards, Charles A. Rosecrans, James E.
Hanson, Gene Sawyer, Frank N., Jr.
Hawkins, Charles C., Schvaneveldt, Noel S.
III Sentell, Joseph W.
Pinson, David L. Wolf, Walter E.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, 509, and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, and section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

LIEUTENANT COLONEL TO COLONEL

Line of the Air Force

Dundas, Donald Sears, 2448A.
Martin, Charles Patrick, 2449A.
Turner, William Millard, 2694A.
Augustinus, Robert Herman, 2724A.
Klein, Edward Colburn, 2761A.
McCollum, Hugh Archie, 2774A.
Lutz, Simon Michael, Jr., 2808A.
Baker, Robert Britton, Jr., 2814A.
Pihlal, Joseph Anton, 2859A.
Brown, Edward Tompkins, 2899A.
Armstrong, Jack Lawrence, 2904A.
Chase, Kenneth Bryant, 2939A.
Bennett, William Albert, Jr., 3067A.
Mabardy, Mitchell Abraham, 19664A.
Packard, Walter Burt, 3205A.
Gugliotta, Philip Anthony, 3254A.
Miller, Fred W., 3257A.
Ellis, Herbert Sargent, 3273A.
Crook, William Ralph, 3282A.
Isbell, James Albert, Jr., 3289A.
Williams, Joseph Bethea, 3463A.
Benjamin, Walter Paul, 3480A.
Savage, Columbus, 3495A.
Sammons, James Nile, 3499A.
Downey, Clyde Jackson, 3502A.
Hamilton, Edwin John, 3503A.
Perkins, Dale, 3505A.
Robinson, Robert Thompson, 3509A.
Workman, Robert Herndon, 3512A.
McColpin, Carol Warren, 3514A.
Earle, Wilton Haynsworth, 3519A.
Sullivan, Charles Edward, Jr., 3524A.
Tortora, Bernardino Ornorio, 3528A.
Cosgrove, Charles Patrick, 3530A.
Dickerson, Robert William, 3548A.
Masters, Robert Eugene, 3551A.
McCarter, Elmer Heath, 3553A.
Haggard, Van Buren, 3555A.
Price, Oran Oscar, 3563A.
Walton, Victor Emanuel, 3569A.
LaPlante, Robert William, 3601A.
Greco, Joseph Alfred Lowry, 3603A.
Fackler, Paul Henry, 3606A.
Prodanovich, George, 3608A.
Pedrazzini, Harold Oliver, 3611A.
Clinkscales, Theodore Ross, 3627A.
Wilson, Keith Streeter, 3623A.
McChristy, Albert Jordan, Jr., 3648A.
Friederichs, Gilbert Francis, 3657A.
McFarland, Earl, Jr., 3667A.
Lavell, Walter Wellman, 3671A.
Fisher, Sydney Gilbert, 3672A.
Esau, Charles Gillies, 3675A.
Colligan, Robert Leonard, Jr., 3676A.
Smith, John Joseph, Jr., 3679A.
Rasmussen, James Holland Stephen, 3681A.
Erwin, William Horace Bruce, 3699A.
Kent, Glenn Altran, 3701A.
Zoeckler, John Lewis, 3724A.
Wolke, Gerard George, 3726A.
Swancutt, Woodrow Paul, 3729A.
Nevins, Hugh Jean, 3733A.
Mitchell, John William, 3741A.
Hanford, Samuel Burton, 3744A.
Edwards, Edward Daniel, 3767A.
Riley, Daniel Edward, 3768A.
Lewis, Archie Robert, 3770A.
Banks, William McGowan, 3775A.
Smith, Arthur Edward, Jr., 3779A.
Read, Elkins, Jr., 3780A.
Egan, John Clarence, 3781A.
Smith, Robert Nelson, 3783A.

Wilkinson, Robert Norman, 3804A.
Smyser, Willis Michael, 3806A.
McGehee, Thomas Kendrick, 3809A.
Sluga, Emil Lawrence, 3811A.
Willis, Benjamin Grant, 3815A.
Ireland, Loren Elsworth, 3820A.
Paul, Leo Francis, 3822A.
Keeling, Gerald Fay, 3827A.
Vandiver, Ray, 3837A.
Bettinger, Sterling Peter, 3842A.
Carter, Wendell Eugene, 3848A.
Humfeld, Harold Emmett, 3857A.
Davis, Howard Allan, 3860A.
Johnsen, Lester James, 3863A.
Johnson, Herbert Elroy, Jr., 3874.
Hamby, Henry Gordon, Jr., 3891A.
Henry, Stephen Wetherell, 3907A.
Fry, Richard Jefferson, 3915A.
Rasmussen, Edward Bernard, 3927A.
Wood, Frank Preuit, 3928A.
Welsh, Albert Michael, 3929A.
Price, Galen Barger, 3931A.
Scott, Oliver McFarlane, 3943A.
Griffith, Stebbins West, 3944A.
Stanton, LeRoy Moore, 3945A.
Gell, Thomas Wesley, 3970A.
Gibbons, Robert Joseph, 3978A.
Laven, George, Jr., 3984A.
Holstrom, Everett Wayne, 3986A.
Wells, Selmon Willard, 3991A.
Ellis, Richard Nat, 4001A.
Carter, George Albert, 4014A.
Watson, Ralph James, 4016A.
Heaton, Donald Haynes, 4032A.
Seawell, William Thomas, 4034A.
Ascani, Fred John, 4036A.
Dessert, Kenneth O'Reilly, 4037A.
Mayo, Ben Isabel, Jr., 4038A.
Gould, Gordon Thomas, Jr., 4040A.
Silk, Joseph Meryl, 4044A.
Rhynard, Wayne Edgar, 4045A.
Watson, Leroy Hugh, Jr., 4052A.
Kunkel, David Ernest, Jr., 4053A.
Brooks, John Adams, 3d, 4059A.
Mitchell, William LeRoy, Jr., 4063A.
Thompson, Clyde Arnold, 4076A.
Seamans, Charles Summer, 3d, 4086A.
Brown, George Scratchley, 4090A.
Hicks, George Luther, 3d, 4092A.
Andrus, Burton Curtis, Jr., 4094A.
Corbin, Thomas Goldsborough, 4097A.
Banks, Wilson Harper, 4104A.
Riordan, Robert Polk, 4107A.
Perego, Frank Smith, 4110A.
Haveman, Allen Ernest, 4112A.
Martensen, William Burke, 4113A.
Lyle, Lewis Elton, 4115A.
Best, Everett William, 4121A.
MacNaughton, Franklin H., 4128A.
Henry, John Bailey, Jr., 4129A.
Northamer, Kenneth Walter, 4131A.
Richmond, Luther Henry, 4133A.
Sonnkalb, Charles David, 4136A.
Brock, Russell Keith, 4140A.
Burns, Robert Wiygul, 4142A.
Brown, Grover Cleveland, 4144A.
Sands, Harry James, Jr., 4145A.
Olson, Robert Alroy, 4153A.
Garrison, Edwin Herbert, 4154A.
O'Neill, John William, 4155A.
McCarthy, James Francis, Jr., 4156A.
Bostwick, George Eugene, 4159A.
Bickell, George Ross, 4160A.
Shankle, Willard Mayes, 4161A.
Hook, Fred G., Jr., 4162A.
Kunkel, John Howard, Jr., 4163A.
Hunziker, Richard Overton, 4164A.
Oliver, Frank Everell, 4166A.

Medical Corps

Cooper, Elven Ross, 19596A.
Niemi, Osmo Ilmar, 19113A.

Dental Corps

Warren, Frederick Wardwell, 18837A.
Harlan, Maurice Cooper, 18858A.

Medical Service Corps

Korn, Bernard, 19410A.

Chaplain

Hamel, Henri A., 18729A.

FIRST LIEUTENANT TO CAPTAIN

Line of the Air Force

Bach, Roy Elwood, 18810A.

Medical Corps

Willis, Henry Stuart Kendall, Jr., 27605A.
Cobb, Leonard Cowgill, 27606A.
White, Melvin Jeffrey, 27607A.
Greene, John Randall, 27608A.
Marx, Frank George, 27609A.
Pollard, Lawrence Welford, Jr., 27607A.
Catlin, Randolph, Jr., 27610A.
Lincoln, Cicero Lee, Jr., 27984A.

Chaplain

Beckley, Robert Howard, 27663A.
Johnston, Roy Benjamin, 27664A.
Holler, Adlai Cornwell, Jr., 27665A.
Webster, Stanley Blosser, 27666A.

Nurse Corps

Coats, Ada Louise, 21403W.
Chandler, Glenna Loving, 21884W.
Maisey, Alberta Frances, 23243W.
Kennedy, Elizabeth Marie, 21713W.
Matter, Helen Elizabeth, 22088W.
Elser, Florence Frances, 21887W.
Porter, Nan Lee, 25755W.
Gernus, Mildred Irene, 25753W.
Davidson, Emma Mae, 25752W.
Henry, Arland Ruth, 25746W.
Ruhe, Carolyn Helen, 25754W.
Fahrenkopf, Bernadette Kathryn, 25751W.
King, Wanda Mae, 23244W.
Burgess, Julia Marie, 25745W.
Arrington, Agnes Maye, 25743W.
Kessler, Doris Mae, 21711W.
Evans, Bertha Elizabeth, 21717W.
Danowski, Dorothy Dolores, 21890W.
Fines, Edith Joan Erb, 25757W.
Gultrau, Genevieve Dora, 26655W.
Peden, Louise Seever, 25747W.

SECOND LIEUTENANT TO FIRST LIEUTENANT

Nurse Corps

Thomas, Patricia Ann, 25355W.

(NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of section 413 (a) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, the following-named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of vice admiral while so serving:

Vice Adm. Herbert G. Hopwood, United States Navy

Rear Adm. Roscoe H. Hillenkoetter, United States Navy

Rear Adm. John M. Will, United States Navy

Vice Adm. Francis C. Denebrink, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Frederick G. Adams | Harold D. Barnhart |
| Michael C. Ahrens | John M. Bauman |
| Sherman G. Alexander | John R. Bellinger |
| George M. Allen, Jr. | Peter C. Bennett |
| Ronald L. Amon | Thomas C. Benson |
| Allan L. Andrade | Robert F. Berg |
| Joseph D. Anthony, Jr. | Roger S. Betts |
| Leonard G. Anton | Duane U. Beving |
| John DuB. Apple, Jr. | William W. Bigler |
| Thomas Ashworth | George E. Biles |
| Garland O. Audilet | III Ralph G. Bird |
| John R. Baals | Gregory J. Blitner |
| Robert A. Buchman | James L. Black |
| LaVon H. Bair | James W. Blanchard, Jr. |
| Robert E. Baker | Frank L. Boebert, Jr. |
| Max M. Baldwin | Arthur C. Boensch |
| Glenn F. Ball | Peter B. Booth |

- Clifford A. Borden
John L. Bossert
Roger E. Box
Phillip C. Brainerd
Charles J. Brockway, Jr.
Nicholas Brown
Robert H. Brown III
James W. Brunner
James W. Bruso
Thomas E. Bruyere
Charles A. Buchanan, Jr.
William C. Bullis
Howard F. Burdick, Jr.
Edmund Burke III
Mattison A. Burt, Jr.
Russell H. Burt
Vernon R. Bush
Weston H. Byng
John M. Caldwell
James R. Cannon
Walter G. Carlson
David M. Carre, Jr.
Richard C. Carrigan
Stanley G. Catola
Carlos M. Charneco, Jr.
Scott A. Chester
Bruce A. Clark
George G. Clark
James M. Clark
Jack D. Clay
Richard V. Clock
Cornelius E. Coleman, Jr.
Merrill F. Collier
LeRoy Collins, Jr.
Richard D. Cook
Ross E. Cook
Wilmer P. Cook
Julian L. Coolidge II
James L. Cooper
James R. Copeland
Charles W. Corkins, Jr.
Delbert J. Cory
Kenneth L. Costilow
Edward J. Covey
Robert J. Craig
Robert P. Craven
Byron A. Cyr
Rudolph H. Daus
Paul J. Davidson
Nicholas J. DeNunzio
David W. Deutermann
Charles J. DiBona
Kenneth A. Dickerson
Robert E. Diedrich
Edward K. Dillard
Harold J. Doebler II
John F. Donahue
Neil Donovan
Frank J. Drayton, Jr.
Roderick A. Dresser
Donald LeR. Dudson
Nathaniel B. Dyer, Jr.
Vernon A. Eagye
Joe D. Edwards
James W. Egerton
Michael Elinski, Jr.
Hal R. Ellis III
William W. Elpers
Frederic H. Evans
James A. Evans
William A. Everett
Frederick P. Eylar
Armand T. Eylar, Jr.
Jerry W. Fallin
Thomas J. Farren
John H. Fellowes
Robert J. Fesler
Theodore A. Fischer, Jr.
Peter K. Fitzwilliam
Dale L. Fjelsted
Frederick P. Flack
Gerard J. Flannery, Jr.
James H. Flatley III
John W. Flight, Jr.
- Everett W. Foote
Robert M. Forster
Paul R. Fournier
Thomas L. Freeman
Henry W. Friedel, Jr.
Gerald A. Fulk
George M. Furlong, Jr.
Richard S. Gaines
Paul R. Gambarani
Charles H. Garrison, Jr.
Elvin L. Gaylor
Walter L. Ghering
James W. Gillman
Michael R. Gluse
Glen E. Good
Paul D. Graf
Frank M. Graham
John C. Grant
Gerald E. Green
William H. Green
Donald L. Grimes
Neil F. Groepler
Frederick W. Hale
Stewart W. Hannah
Donald C. Hanson
Morton H. Hanson
Robert H. Harris
Ross R. Hatch
Douglass F. Hayman, Jr.
Duane L. Helsinger
Roy C. Hejhall
Albert L. Henry, Jr.
John A. Henry, Jr.
William F. Henry
Harry E. Hicks
John R. Hicks
Raymond W. Hill
Fermor W. Hobbs III
Fredrick C. Hoerner
Chauncey F. Hoffman
Herbert F. Hoffman, Jr.
James R. Hogg
Clyde G. Hohenstein
Vernon C. Honsinger
Roger B. Horne, Jr.
Donald L. Horvath
Arthur K. Hovater
William J. Howell
William S. Hull
Harold W. Hussey
Muri E. Husted, Jr.
Frank LeQ. Ingram
Philip D. Isaac
Lyle M. Ishol
Robert H. Jaeger
Ernest W. James
Jack P. Janetatos
Guy C. Jarratt III
Walter E. Jennings
Richard S. Jensen
Gunnar S. Jensen
Andre L. Jernee
James E. Johnson
Donald H. Johnston, Jr.
Donald W. Johnston
Darrell E. Jones
Jerry E. Jones
Henry M. Jordan
Arthur E. Keegan
Robert M. Keller
Frank B. Kelso II
Robert D. Kemper
George W. Kenaston
John H. Kinert
Ben J. Kinney
John H. Kirkpatrick
Melvin A. Klein
Seraphim D. Koutas
Thomas R. Krieger
Herbert B. Kuykendall
William A. LaBarge
Jimmie D. Lakey
John J. Lally
Francis J. LaMotte
John P. Langenheim
Thomas R. Langley, Jr.
- Burton R. Laub, Jr.
Philip G. Leahy
Harry F. Lenhardt, Jr.
Richard J. Levendoski
Charles A. Levis
Theodore E. Lewin
Harold S. LeWis
Frederick J. Lind
Donald E. Lindquist
Frederick G. Lippert
David B. Lloyd
Lawrence A. Lowden
Rex F. McAllister, Jr.
Michael A. McBride
Dale R. McClure
James C. McCoy, Jr.
John R. McCravy, Jr.
Richard J. F. McDermott
Walter I. McDonnell, Jr.
John G. McGarry
Daniel R. McGrath
Robert J. McHugh, Jr.
John R. McLaughlin
Lee Q. McMillan
Eugene J. McPartland
Albert A. McPherson
John J. Macan
Malcolm J. Macdonald
Henry L. Maines
Malcolm A. Malloy
Richard J. Mann
Joseph H. Maston III
Douglas S. Mayfield
Samuel E. Mays, Jr.
Channing W. Medwed
Danny J. Michaels
Hoyle H. Miller, Jr.
John M. Miller, Jr.
Kenneth L. Miller
Wayne W. Miller
William H. Miller
James L. Milne
David C. Minton III
Harold A. Moore, Jr.
Garner E. Mogan, Jr.
Alexander R. Morris
Charles S. Morris
Robert B. Morris, Jr.
Edmund C. Mortimer
Wallace L. Mossop, Jr.
Richard A. Mozier
Charles S. Mulloy
Frank S. Murray
William M. Musgrove
"L" "D" Nagel
Carl A. Nelson
Paul J. Nelson, Jr.
Sven D. Nelson
Henry H. Neuhaard
Alfred C. Newbury
James W. Newcomb, Jr.
Murray M. J. Nicholson, Jr.
Thomas A. Northam, Jr.
Donald B. O'Connell
Jerome A. O'Connell
Kyran M. O'Dwyer
Donald T. Ogram
Douglass J. Ohmen
William J. O'Keefe
Theodore E. Oliverio
Wayne R. Osgood
James L. Owen
Dwight C. Owings
Edgar H. Parker
Stephen M. Patten
Richard D. Petersen
Karl L. Peterson
Peter C. Peterson, Jr.
Theodore C. Pickel, Jr.
Benjamin L. Poe, Jr.
Wendell W. Powell
William H. Price II
John C. Putnam
Peter N. Randrup
James P. Ransom II
Allen E. Reed, Jr.
- Paul J. Reese
Willis S. Rich
Douglas V. Rigler
Charles R. Roberts
Ned C. Roberts
Richard D. Roberts
Hollis E. Robertson
Robert D. Rodgers
Vincent W. Roper
Thomas M. Ryan
Dean R. Sackett, Jr.
Robert J. Sampson
Hugh P. Sams
Stephen E. Sargent
Robert J. Scanlon
Robert G. Schatz
Ernest J. Scheyder
Herbert A. Schick
Edward W. Schildhauer
George F. Schilling
Robert H. Schmidt
Vincent L. Schmidt
Walter L. Schneider III
William M. Schoessel, Jr.
Raymond J. Schreiner
John M. Schulze, Jr.
Ralph C. Schwartz
Melvin B. Schweiger
Thomas P. Scott
William W. Scott
Edward A. Sechrest
John R. Seesholtz
Richard W. Shafer
David A. Shelo
Robert A. Shinn
Benjamin F. Short
Theodore B. Shultz
Robert H. Shumaker
David N. Sibley
James H. Sikes
George T. K. Simpson
William H. Simpson
William T. Slaughter
William D. Sloan
John H. Slough
Robert R. Smiley III
Harold L. Smith, Jr.
James W. Smith
Norman M. Smith
Phillip J. Smith
William R. Smith
Richard C. Snyder
Fred G. Spellman
Peter J. Spink
Walter H. Stammer, Jr.
Christopher M. Stefanou
John C. Sterling
Connolly D. Stevenson
James W. Stinson
Lowell P. Stone
Gene F. Sullivan
Harlan D. Swanson, Jr.
Clarence O. Taft, Jr.
Joseph T. Talbert, Jr.
Richard R. Tarbuck
Frank B. Tatom
David S. Teachout
James G. Thomas
Benton G. Thompson
John D. Thurber
Barrick F. Tibbitts
Edward L. Toohey, Jr.
Donald N. Topping
James B. Townsend
Maurice F. Tyler, Jr.
James M. Van Metre
John A. Wagner
Brian F. Walker
Compton E. Ward
Robert L. Watkins
John A. Webster, Jr.
David Weggeland
Russell H. Weidman
George T. Welsh
Edwin K. Wharton
Laurence A. White, Jr.
Richard F. White
Jack M. Wilbern
John H. Wilde, Jr.
George H. Wilkins
Forrest R. Williams
- Charles N. Wilson
Eric J. Wilson
Stephen A. Wise
Marc T. Wolff
Orpheus L. Woodbury
Gene L. Woodruff
Herbert P. Woods
Carl B. Wootten, Jr.
Joseph M. P. Wright, Jr.
Orville Wright, Jr.
Frank F. Zechlin
Robert W. Zimmerman
- The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps in the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:
- Robert A. Allen, Jr.
Victor J. Baricev
Jack R. Binns
Stanley L. Booth
John S. Boyd
George D. Broyles
John E. Buckley
Whitmore S. Butts, Jr.
George S. Connolly, Jr.
Donald E. Coyne
James A. Dickey
Harold E. Dolenga
Thomas E. Eaton, Jr.
Jules J. Gervais, Jr.
Robert G. Harmon
Ernest C. M. Higgins
Edward N. Hobson
Robert Houghton
William S. Hunt, Jr.
Lloyd B. W. Kriner
John R. Legendre
William G. Loveday, Jr.
- Patrick R. McCool
Lawrence E. McCullers
Franklin D. McMullen, Jr.
Jacob G. Oakr, Jr.
James E. Orange
Douglas C. Osgood
Louis A. Perrone
William A. Peters
Louis J. Pfeiffer
Jan S. Prokop
Donald A. Sacarob
Franklin D. Smith
William H. Stiles
Donald R. Stone
Isidore L'A. Tobin III
Richard S. Walsh
Perry L. Westmoreland
James A. White
Robert L. Williams
Corbin Woodward, Jr.
Eugene A. Wrobel
Edward A. Zabrycki
- The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps in the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:
- Charles C. Baggs
Paul H. Bradtmiller
Robert E. Quinn, Jr.
- Robert A. Schade, Jr.
John J. Shanley, Jr.
James E. Whelan
- The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns (engineering duty only) in the Navy subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:
- James M. Taylor
Richard L. Thomas
- The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns (special duty only) in the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:
- Richard O. Allen, Jr.
Edward I. H. Bennett, Jr.
Donald L. Brown
Joseph W. Harrison
Angus D. McEachen III
- Nelson E. Moore
Carl Schleicher
Robert W. Schmitt
Frank D. Scovel
John S. Wilson
Frederick E. Wright
- The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:
- Andre N. Abele
Paul R. Ackerman
Kenneth G. Ackroyd
Benjamin S. Adams
Jerome B. Adams
Richard D. Adams
Robert W. Adams
Thomas C. Adams
James W. Adolphson
William P. Albrecht
Henry C. Alden
Jaime P. Alexander
William H. Ali III
Frank A. Allard
Corbett U. Allen, Jr.
Edward P. Allen
Frederick J. Allen
John E. Allen
John McL. Allred
James W. Amis, Jr.
James B. Anderson
Paul N. Anderson
Salvatore J. Angelico
Layne B. Anspach
David L. Armstrong
Lloyd R. Armstrong
Thomas F. Arnold
Peter D. Arrowsmith
- Robert L. Atkinson
Robert S. Attiueh
Franklin P. Auwarter
Arthur DeL. Ayrault, Jr.
Arthur A. Bailey, Jr.
John L. Bailey
Evan S. Baker
Robert C. Baker
John W. Ballard
William M. Ballietto, Jr.
Harold E. Barnes
Charles E. Barnett
John E. Barrett, Jr.
William L. Barrett, Jr.
Robert L. Barry
Neil J. Barta
Robert H. Bartley
Jerry J. Bass
Charles G. Bassett
Ned P. Baugh
Harold L. Baynes
Robert R. Beach
Lawrence L. Beall
Joseph J. Beard
Nathaniel O. Beasley
Paul F. Beatty

William H. Beden-Harold J. Castner
 baugh Wilfred B. Caton
 Phillip M. Belisle James A. Cavanaugh,
 John E. Benadum Jr.
 Phillip W. Benedikts-Leonard H. Caveny
 son Douglas S. Chalmers
 Earl H. Benser Dean A. Chambers
 Richard C. Bensman Donald G. Champlin
 John D. Bentley Charles W. Chandler
 John L. Berg Paul W. Chapman
 Elmer L. Bergstraser Kenneth W. Chappell
 Theodore J. Berntsen Duward E. Chastain
 William H. Berry Eugene S. Cherry
 Fred A. Besel John Cheston
 John M. Beshoar William S. Chilton
 Albert H. Best III John H. Christ
 Francis X. Beytagh, Jr. Philip J. Christensen
 Henry E. Bilkey, Jr. Thomas J. Christman
 Robert J. Bitts Sylvester G. Chumley
 Josiah H. Blackmore II Gilliam Clark, Jr.
 Samuel J. Blackwell, Leonard J. Clark, Jr.
 Jr. Robert W. Clark, Jr.
 Benjamin C. Blake, Jr. Ted G. Clause
 Gordon N. Blake Steven K. Cochran
 Warren W. Blakely Silas B. Coley, Jr.
 Jack J. Bland Charles A. Collins
 Robert E. Blank, Jr. George A. Coltrane
 Lurton W. Blassin-Craig Comstock
 game Edmund T. Comstock,
 Douglas J. Blatt III
 Robert B. Bliss James H. Conley
 "S" "C" Bogges III Laurence M. Connell
 William S. Bolte Donald A. Connelly
 Robert L. Bootes David W. Conrath
 Andrew J. Borcik, Jr. Frank P. Conte
 Gary L. Boshears Fred J. Contrata, Jr.
 William C. Bourke Charles W. Cook, Jr.
 Raymond J. Bouvin Joseph A. Cook
 John C. Bowne Clyde "F" Coombs, Jr.
 Leonard G. Brackeen, Gary O. Cooper
 Jr. Henry Cox
 Charles T. Bradshaw Gerald G. Craddock
 Heinz R. Brandt Edward A. Cramer, Jr.
 James W. Brannigan, John A. Cramer, Jr.
 Jr. William R. Crate
 Robert N. Brannock Richard L. Crawford
 David M. Brant Gene B. Cross
 William McK. Braselton, Jr. Robert T. Crow
 Christopher G. Crow-
 son
 Edmond L. Brasseur James F. Crum
 Donald J. Brautigam James V. Cuff, Jr.
 Ambrose K. Brennan, David H. Cullen
 Jr. Alan "B" Cutter
 Marc A. Brenner John Dale
 Walter C. Brestel, Jr. Joseph M. Daley, Jr.
 Richard A. Bright Kenneth M. Dankel
 Sterling M. Brockwell, Harry M. Davidson
 Jr. John G. Davies
 Ora D. Brown III Jackson K. Davis, Jr.
 Robert F. Brown, Jr. Jacob E. Davis II
 Robert E. Browne Leroy L. Dawson, Jr.
 William C. Brumfield Leroy L. Dawson, Jr.
 Richard R. Brummett John T. Day, Jr.
 Paul C. Brunet William C. Deans
 Erwine T. Bucken- David A. DeBell
 malar, Jr. Armando Delapaz
 Gary L. Buckwalter David S. Dennis
 William S. Buehler James E. Dennison
 Robert F. Bullock Douglas J. Denton
 Willard J. Burch Richard W. Devane,
 Edward M. Burgess Jr.
 Robert A. Burke Robert M. Dever
 Paul Burnham Richard L. Devich
 Robert H. Burr William J. Dick
 Raymond D. Butler Robert A. Dole, Jr.
 Ralph L. Button Douglas J. Donohue
 Michael J. Byrne Edward W. Donovan,
 Olin R. Cable, Jr. Jr.
 Richard P. Calhoun Edward E. Doolan
 Richard G. Camacho Burton T. Doremus,
 Alan H. Campbell Jr.
 Ronald K. Campbell Henry Dormitzer II
 Ralph A. Capshaw Frank C. Dorsey
 Joseph W. Carlson, Jr. William R. Dorsey III
 Joe D. Carr William F. Dove
 William J. Carr, Jr. Carl S. Downing
 James T. Carroll Peter Downs
 Michael S. Carswell Robert T. Draughon
 John B. Carter Paul J. Driscoll
 John L. Carter Frederick H. Duffield,
 Richard A. Carter Jr.
 William O. Carter, Jr. Kenneth D. Duncan

Paul E. Dunmire
 Charles G. Durfee
 Taylor R. Durham
 John W. Durr III
 Jerry C. Dusthimer
 Charles "M" Earnest
 Joshua V. Edwards
 Theodore J. Elder
 Philip S. Elkins
 Frank K. Ellis
 Peter R. Ellis
 Frank F. Embick, Jr.
 William J. Engle
 James R. English, Jr.
 David L. Englund
 George B. Enoch
 Sheridan B. Ensley
 Eugene D. Eppen
 Malcolm L. Erich
 Kermit R. Escudier, Jr.
 Frederick A. Ethridge
 David L. Evans
 Richard S. Evans
 Marvin L. Eyer
 Fred F. Farmer
 Lawrence R. Farmer
 John H. Farris
 John H. Farrow, Jr.
 Norman A. Felsenthal
 Robert LeR. Ferguson
 James L. Ferro
 William E. Feurer, Jr.
 Byron Fielding
 George E. Fink
 John M. S. Finney
 John R. Firth
 Edmund W. Fisher, Jr.
 John H. Fite, Jr.
 Richard B. Fitzpatrick
 Charles R. Flather
 Samuel A. Fleshman II
 Daniel F. Flynn
 Nathaniel E. Flynn
 Robert H. Ford
 Neville D. Fowler
 Otis O. Fox
 Rector C. Fox III
 Irwin Z. Frank
 Thomas P. Frank
 George M. Fredrickson
 Jerre M. Freeman
 James C. Freund
 Charles H. Frey
 Charles L. Fries
 Robert E. Fritts
 Charles R. Fuller
 Edwin P. Gable
 Henry H. Gaffney, Jr.
 Milton J. Gaines
 Gino E. Gallina
 George W. Gardner
 Robert H. Gardner
 Edwin J. Garn
 Albert E. Garrett III
 John O. Garvey
 Donald M. Gay
 Robert J. Gebel
 Jerry D. Geist
 Thomas L. Gibbons
 James C. Gibson, Jr.
 Robert M. Gifford
 William F. Gilchrist
 Robert H. Gile
 Richard A. Gill
 Leonard E. Giuliani
 Lawrence MacN. Gleason
 Culver C. Godfrey, Jr.
 Robert A. Gonsalves
 Tarrant A. Gooch
 Philip I. Goodman
 Winthrop M. Goodwin
 Richard T. Gralow
 Richard P. Gramley
 Freeman A. Grant, Jr.
 William E. Green
 William H. Griffin
 Richard A. Groeneveld
 Ronald R. Grove
 Robert "C" Grover
 John K. Gschwind

William A. Guiffre
 Malcolm W. Guild
 Stewart E. Gully
 Francis S. Hackney
 Edwin R. Haering
 Dayton R. Hahne
 Roger L. Hale
 George K. Haley
 James W. Hall
 Robert A. Hall
 Ralph E. Hamilton
 Glenn Hanna
 Walter L. Hannum
 Robert W. Hansen
 John L. Hanson, Jr.
 George K. Harding, Jr.
 Jay H. Hardy
 Jack E. Harmon
 Buford A. Harris, Jr.
 Jack E. Harris
 David G. Harscheid
 Robert L. Harshman
 Donald F. Hart
 Douglas Hart
 Patrick E. Hart
 Hugh B. Haskell
 Cleighton J. Hastad
 Robert N. Haven
 Richard A. Hays
 Peter S. Hearst
 Robert D. Heatherly
 Richard J. Heimer
 Richard A. Hein
 John P. Helmick, Jr.
 Robert L. Hemmerling
 James A. Henderson
 Richard H. Henderson
 Edward Hennessee
 Richard D. Hensel
 Michael McC. Hercher
 Paul H. Herzog
 Donald J. Hesketh
 Robert M. Hetterly
 James M. Hickerson
 Owen W. Hickey
 John C. Hiebert
 Melvin L. Hildebrandt
 Richard T. Hill
 Walter P. Hines
 William H. Hinkes
 James W. Hinkley IV
 Don G. Hinsvark
 Benjamin R. Hippe
 Gilbert R. Hitchcock
 James R. Hlavin
 Charles Hodggate, Jr.
 William L. Hodgskiss
 John P. Holm
 Billy H. Holmes
 Leslie K. Y. Hong
 William K. Hoskins
 John T. Houk, Jr.
 John H. Hubbard
 Fred P. Hueber
 Arthur L. Hufnagel
 George Huling, Jr.
 Donald E. Huntington,
 Jr.
 William T. Iler
 James H. Jacobs
 Donald MacI. James
 John C. Jamison
 Frank R. Janisch
 James M. Jeffords
 Alexander Jenkins III
 Mark J. Jennings
 Lawrence C. Jensen
 Robert B. Jensen
 Keith D. Jewell
 Craig I. Johnson
 Pierce Johnson, Jr.
 Richard M. Johnson
 Robert E. Johnson
 James R. Johnston
 Gordon B. Jolley
 John A. Jones
 Robert F. Jones
 Henry W. Jordan
 Crawley F. Joyner III
 Thomas A. Kahrl
 Richard A. Kammann
 Kurt W. Karmlin

Alvin R. Karn, Jr.
 Grant W. Kearn
 Paul L. Kearney
 Dennis Kealey
 Dennis E. Kennedy
 Earl L. Kenworthy
 Charles D. Kepner, Jr.
 Charles R. Kern
 Richard A. Kerr
 William T. Kilbourne
 II
 Monte L. Killings-
 worth
 Stanley R. Kingman,
 Jr.
 James M. Kingsbury
 Calvin H. Kinsley
 Thomas C. Kirkman,
 Jr.
 Wayne A. Kirkpatrick
 John C. Kirscher
 Barry D. Kirschbaum
 Albert D. Kirwan, Jr.
 Frank H. Klein
 Peter M. Klein
 John A. Kleinheinz
 Philipp B. K. Knake,
 Jr.
 Andrew G. Knezich
 George H. Knightly
 Ernest J. Kohl
 Walter A. Kordex
 Erich "F" Korman
 Roger J. Kowalsky
 John R. Kraft
 James B. Kramer, Jr.
 Rex W. Kramer, Jr.
 Donald M. Kresge
 John W. Krieger
 John J. Krimm
 Herbert P. Krog
 Ralph E. Kromer
 George C. Kronmiller,
 Jr.
 James H. Krutzfeldt
 Algene J. Kuchinka
 John W. Kuhl
 Trammell C. Lacey, Jr.
 Nick J. Ladas
 Charles A. Laforge, Jr.
 Joseph F. Lake
 Arne S. Landaas
 Wesley A. Landen, Jr.
 Grover W. Lang
 John O. Langley
 James B. Langworthy
 William T. Lanier
 James L. Larsen
 William V. Laszlo
 Peter C. Lauterbach
 Robert W. Lawrence
 James MacN. LeCuyer
 Gerald D. Lehmer
 Harold DeW. Lester
 John W. Leth
 John F. Lewis
 Norman H. Lewis
 Richard B. Lewis
 Robert S. Lewis
 Jon C. Liebman
 Bruce R. Lippke
 George F. Lockeman,
 Jr.
 Cecil P. Loehelt
 Harold F. Lombard, Jr.
 Mathew R. Loonin
 John W. Losa
 Donald G. Lowry
 Allen H. Loyd
 Fitz O. Lufkin, Jr.
 Richard E. Luybli
 Deane R. Lyan
 Byron C. Lynch, Jr.
 William M. McAllister
 Phillip M. McCarthy
 Joseph M. McCabe
 Robert A. McCaffery
 Charles H. McCaghy
 Robert C. McClanahan
 Jerry McCleskey
 William F. McClure
 John H. McComb

Richard L. McCormack
 Ronald K. McCreight
 John J. McDermott
 Russell B. McDonough,
 Jr.
 William J. McDonough
 James R. McEwen
 Paul L. McKaskle
 William M. McKeeman
 Louis A. McKellar
 Mark H. McKinsey, Jr.
 Charles R. McLean
 Gerald L. McMahon
 Michael T. McNevin
 Bruce G. McPhee
 Stanley R. McSwain
 Ronald B. MacDiarmid
 James B. MacDonald
 John M. MacEwen
 Arthur J. Mackey, Jr.
 John H. MacLaren
 Donald T. Maclay
 Rankin DeW. Magill
 Edward A. Mainland
 Michael N. Malitz
 John D. Malone
 William C. Manes
 Thomas D. Marks, Jr.
 Merritt R. Marquardt
 Michael R. Marron
 Richard A. Marselle
 Karl E. Martersteck,
 Jr.
 Frank P. Martin
 Joseph D. Mathewson
 Myron F. Maxson
 Charles J. Maxwell
 John J. Mayo, Jr.
 Alfred W. Medcalf
 Johnny G. Medlin, Jr.
 Leonard M. Meier
 William W. Mellette
 Edmund W. Melvin
 William W. Melvin
 Ronald K. Mengel
 Robert E. Merki
 Grant C. Merrill
 Alan Merson
 Donald O. Metcalf
 Bruce C. Meyer
 Jan H. H. Meyer 3d
 Allen W. Miller
 Frank Mlodzikowski
 Charles W. Moncure
 Donald L. Morgan
 John J. Morgan
 Wilfred T. Morioka
 Napoleon L. Morris
 Robert J. Morris
 Robert L. Morrison
 Arnold W. Morton
 Richard E. Morton
 Thomas F. Mosher
 John T. Mullen
 Ronald M. Muller
 James McA. Murphy
 Paul W. Murrill
 William A. Musgrove
 Richard A. Myers
 John R. Neff
 Robert A. Nerrie
 Walter T. Neubacher
 Stephen L. Newnham
 David W. Nicholas
 Jul M. Nickerson
 Willis B. Nickerson,
 Jr.
 John D. Niles
 Bertil D. Nordin
 Kenneth L. Norman
 Thomas W. Nuckols
 Harry O. Nutting III
 Paul A. Oberbeck
 Ronald J. Oberle
 Robert K. O'Brien
 Edwin A. O'Connor
 Darryl D. Olson
 John A. Onderdonk, Jr.
 James A. O'Rourke
 David N. Orrick
 Bernard P. Orzech

Robert A. Osborne
 William S. Overton III
 John M. Page
 Thomas W. Page
 Charles F. Palmer
 Harry F. Palmer
 John S. Parke
 Thomas R. Parker
 James Parmiter
 Richard R. Paske
 Francis C. Pasquinnelli
 Alan D. Pasternak
 George D. Patterson
 III
 James M. Patton
 Douglas A. Peake
 Robert F. Peek
 James E. Pellettieri
 Jr.
 Lyle E. Pellock
 Joseph W. Penders
 Thomas C. Perkins
 Albert J. Perry
 James F. Peterson
 Noel H. Petree, Jr.
 Darrell R. Pieper
 Richard L. Plaut, Jr.
 John K. Poggenburg
 Jr.
 Clarence R. Polfer
 John C. Polking
 Parker F. Pond, Jr.
 Donald R. Poole
 Donald H. Portch
 John S. Porter, Jr.
 Wells P. Poulsen, Jr.
 Leonard F. Powell
 LeRoy R. Price
 Cornelius B. Prior, Jr.
 Reed R. Probst
 Ronald M. Propper
 William E. Quillinan
 James E. Quinn, Jr.
 Peter J. Quinn
 Roy M. Raja
 Harr F. Ranney
 Thomas J. Rappel
 Philip W. Rathbun
 Niels J. Reimers
 Kent S. Renshaw
 Gerald G. Reppetto
 Theodore F. Reusswig
 Jr.
 Max C. Richardson
 Ronald H. Richter
 George B. Riefier
 John F. Rish
 Theodore C. Robbins
 Bobby W. Roberts
 Gordon J. "A" Roberts
 David W. Robinson
 Eugene I. Robinson
 David M. Rockmore
 Garland A. Roe
 Charles E. Roegge
 David E. Rosenbaum
 Joe O. Ross
 Rodney S. Rougelot
 Carl R. Rundell
 Charles W. Runnette
 III
 Charles W. Rusch
 William M. Russ, Jr.
 John A. Rutgers
 Frederick E. Sallade
 Arthur Salzpass
 Marvin C. Sanders
 Dwayne C. Savage
 Samuel L. Sayers
 Gerhard R. Schade, Jr.
 John J. Schang
 William A. Schlapper
 Kurt G. A. Schlick
 Thomas D. Schlobohm
 Stuart G. Schmid
 Adrian W. Schmid-
 hauser
 William F. Schmiedel
 Edward A. Schmitt
 Daniel N. Schmoker
 Maurice T. Schmoll
 Howard A. Schneider

Jay W. Schwartz
 Hans T. Schwarz
 Douglas A. Scott
 John P. Scudder
 Fred A. Sears
 John A. Sears, Jr.
 James G. Seebold
 Richard H. Setlowe
 Philip R. Shafer
 James R. Shaid
 Roy Shank
 Francis P. Shannon
 Fred H. Sharp, Jr.
 George E. Shear
 Amos T. Showalter
 Joseph L. Showalter
 William D. Simerville
 Alexander Simkovich
 Charles W. Simmons
 III
 Leonard Simpson
 Ronald K. Sley
 John H. Sloan
 Thomas M. Sloan
 Herbert E. Smetheram
 Bobby E. Smith
 Lawrence H. Smith
 Robert L. Smith
 Sherwood H. Smith,
 Jr.
 Robert E. Snow
 Gilbert R. Sommer
 William C. Sones
 Philip E. Sonnet
 Jerry C. Soper
 William J. Soss
 Lauren M. Soth
 Roy G. Sowley
 Arnold W. Staedell
 Rex P. Stallings
 James S. Stanford
 Robert M. Stanford
 Kenneth R. Stapleford
 Bradley W. Stark
 Walter W. Stark
 Robert B. Steece
 Collin G. Steele, Jr.
 Robert E. Stengle
 Barr S. Stevenson
 John J. St. John
 Terry L. Stockham
 Sigurd I. Stocking
 Robert H. Stotz
 Robert H. Stratford
 George R. Strohmeier
 Charles E. Strong
 John M. Stuhldreher
 Newell M. Stultz
 James D. Stutz
 John L. Sullivan
 Michael P. Sullivan
 Norman E. Sumner
 Jerrold T. Sundt
 Gilbert C. Sutton
 John P. Swezey
 Robert L. Swingle
 Ronald H. Swinnerton
 Donald P. Swisher
 John H. Swope IV
 Herman E. Tarnow
 Dan L. Taylor
 Larry J. Taylor
 Carter S. Terrell
 Arvel D. Tharp
 Alexander Thomas
 Charles H. Thomas II
 John H. Thomas
 Allan R. Thompson
 Donald C. Thompson
 Donald H. Thompson
 Theodore Thomte
 Robert E. Thorne
 James L. Thorson
 Jon S. Thurneysen
 John M. Tiderman
 Stanley M. Titus
 James R. Tracy
 Leigh B. Trevor
 Robert G. Tripp
 Reidar A. Trosdal, Jr.
 Adam R. Trupp

Edwin B. Tucker
 James E. Tucker
 Benjamin B. Turner
 Jr.
 Charles H. Turner
 Dudley R. Turner
 James R. Turner
 Peter H. Turner
 Robert R. Turner
 John A. Turpin
 Clinton L. Tuttle
 Thomas D. Tuttle
 Joseph W. Twinam
 Thomas R. Ulrich
 Richard J. Urban
 Richard C. Ustick
 William C. Vail
 Kenneth M. Valentine
 Daniel A. VanDuyne
 Alfred L. VanSickel
 Leroy W. Varettoni
 Robert E. Vaughan III
 Thomas R. Viknelson
 Bruce R. Viloudaki
 Clifford J. VonHoene
 Richard L. Vonier
 Joe L. Vowell
 Charles H. Waldron
 Howard R. Warner
 Mitchum E. Warren,
 Jr.
 Robert V. Watkins
 Thomas J. Watson
 Edward R. Way
 Ross A. Webber
 Gustave A. Weber, Jr.
 James F. Weber
 Frederick E. Welcker,
 Jr.
 Frank A. Weldknecht
 William M. Wein-
 berger
 John L. Welborn
 Richard D. Welch
 William L. Welch
 Hugh A. Weston, Jr.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Lawrence F. Arnold
 Peter C. Babcock
 Harvey C. Barragar
 Robert J. Boike
 Thomas G. Brown
 Edgar G. Bulluck
 Carroll J. Campbell
 Edwin F. Cooke
 Ula H. Cozart III
 Franklin D. Crutch-
 field
 Robert Curry
 Gerald R. Daughtridge
 Charles V. Doherty
 Edwin J. Feller, Jr.
 Ernest A. E. Gellhorn
 Wayne W. Gersten-
 berger
 William G. Goodwin
 Donald B. Gruelle
 Newton G. Hardie, Jr.
 Louis L. Hell
 Philip S. Heinecke
 Donald A. Johnston
 Robert A. Johnston
 Kyle D. Krusemark
 Robert D. LaMoreaux

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIETENANT COMMANDER
 Roy G. Brown

LIETENANT
 Ralph E. MacNaughton

LIETENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)
 Richard T. Upton

Harold S. Westphal,
 Jr.
 William F. Whalen
 Orville E. Wheeler
 Henry M. White, Jr.
 James D. Whiteside
 Guy K. Whitfield
 James W. Whittington
 Jerry R. Whittlesey
 Frederick P. Whittum
 John C. Widman, Jr.
 Charles L. Wiedrich
 William E. Wiegand
 James D. Wilder
 Frank E. Williams
 Jerome B. Williams
 Richard E. Williams
 Robert C. Williams
 Thomas W. Williams,
 Jr.
 Nicholas J. Willis
 Bruce B. Wilson
 Charles R. Wilson
 Paul G. Wilson
 William R. Wilson, Jr.
 David E. Winer
 John L. Witt
 Arthur F. Woerber
 Charles R. Wolf
 David R. Womack
 Bruce R. Wood
 Charles L. Wood, Jr.
 Rex S. Wood
 Lucien C. Woodhouse
 Jess B. Woods, Jr.
 David B. Woodward
 Allan M. Woolson
 George Woron
 Bruce H. Wyma
 Richard A. York
 Joseph E. Youmans
 Ronald E. Young
 Hercules P. Zagoras
 Larry E. Zent
 Chester A. Zinn, Jr.
 William D. Zirbel
 Bertram R. Zweifel

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIETENANT
 Joseph L. Sedwitz
 LIETENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)
 Russell Miller, Jr.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIETENANT COMMANDER
 Joseph J. Hoyt
 LIETENANT
 Billie F. Outlaw
 LIETENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)
 David A. Ferguson
 Theodore C. Riegelman

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officers in the United States Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Robert F. Ault, W-4.
 John R. Gorman, W-4.
 Albert F. Christener, W-3.
 Walter A. Janas, W-3.
 John C. Valek, W-3.

Ensign Russell L. Rose, Supply Corps, United States Navy, for transfer to and permanent appointment in the line of the Navy in the grade of ensign.

The following-named officer candidates to be ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert L. Allen, Jr.
 Homer W. Alton
 Charles R. Anderson
 George J. Arrighi, Jr.
 Paul R. Avery
 George M. Bailey
 Clifford W. Bandy
 William J. Barbour,
 Jr.
 Donald R. Bauer
 Harold R. Brenneman
 William L. Brennen
 Bernard A. Brooks
 Elmer L. Browning
 Wallace R. Bruns
 Charles E. Clynes
 Erwin A. Collins
 Leo J. Connolly
 Francis A. Conti
 Harold E. Cox, Jr.
 Dean E. Cramer
 John Cremo, Jr.
 Billy R. Crim
 Robert Cross
 Donald E. Cunning-
 ham
 Hilton L. Cutler, Jr.
 William F. Denison
 Robert E. Driskell
 Alton R. Evans
 Gerald F. Faircloth
 Lynn E. Gee
 Donald Gibson
 Eugene R. Glenn
 Kenneth A. Gregory
 Verlie M. Hamilton
 William R. Harris
 Fremont G. Haswell,
 Jr.
 Newton G. Hayes
 Hubert B. Herring
 Jimmie E. Hickman
 Kenneth E. Hill
 James R. Holliday
 David E. Hutchinson
 William A. Ingram
 Jerry V. Jenkins
 Guy Keenum
 William H. Kersting
 Robert L. Kirkwood
 Burton L. Knight

Maurice G. LaFave
 John V. Laird
 Bill Lakin
 Arno H. Laux
 William A. Leird
 Ray M. McDonald
 Claude A. McGee
 Mercer L. McKinney,
 Jr.
 Robert R. Mayer
 Herbert A. Miller
 Charles J. Murrell
 John A. Norman, Jr.
 George H. Overstreet
 Ervin E. Padgett, Jr.
 Jerry J. Palmer
 Thomas W. Parker
 Joseph P. Persell
 Frederick C. Philipp
 Elmer F. Poyet
 Moody L. Pritchett
 Ralph G. Reid, Jr.
 Ellwood B. Reinhardt,
 Jr.
 John R. Rinn
 Tommie W. Roberts
 George W. Rosendale,
 Jr.
 Claude E. Rush
 Frederick R. Sabine
 Richard E. Saleh
 Ramon A. Sesma
 Joseph C. Smith
 Thomas F. Smith
 Vernon C. Smith
 Charles C. Stewart
 Elmer M. Stone
 Bruce A. Tager
 William J. Thomte
 Dan "J" Tikalsky
 Wade A. Tralla
 Rocco D. Vallera
 Logan E. VanPool
 Edward F. Walder, Jr.
 George D. Wehner
 Walton E. Wells
 Clarence A. White
 Nelson E. Windsor
 Harold R. Woodside
 Robert LeR. Zipse

The following-named officer candidates to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

| | |
|---------------------|----------------------|
| Eric W. H. Billicke | Kenneth H. Maxwell |
| Francis W. Carson | Joseph P. Mitts |
| James R. Durbin | Vincent J. Pistolesi |
| Douglas L. Erickson | Raymond V. Sullivan |
| Daniel S. Gregorio | James C. Woodard |
| Kinner C. Mason | Harold C. Wright |

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification deck, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

| | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|
| James E. Ballou | Albert D. Isenberg |
| Stephen B. Barnett | Walter C. Kurz |
| James E. Brown | John D. McKinnon |
| George E. Campbell | Jack L. Reifschneider |
| Howard C. Davis | Rodney R. Reynolds |
| Joseph A. Hierholzer | Ronald W. Richardson |
| Edgbert F. Howard | James W. Warren |
| William D. Hughes | |

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification ordnance, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------|
| George H. Clayton, Jr. | Robert G. O'Donnell |
| John H. Dolan | Odd B. Pedersen |
| Richard J. Halloran | Robert E. Peetz |
| Myron S. Johnson | Robert J. Robertson |
| Eugene A. Marcoux | Clayton L. Sheppy |
| William N. Morgan | Robert F. Vincent |
| Eugene A. Mount | Charles J. Whitbeck |
| Dorance L. Ochs | |

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification administration, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

| | |
|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Lynn B. Bean | Oliver E. Harmon |
| Richard S. Benoit | Frederick G. Ingalls |
| Roy A. Berry | Robert D. Jebb |
| Jesse V. Boyer, Jr. | Edward C. Keeley |
| Mario J. Cicchetto | Francis S. Palne, Jr. |
| Paul L. Dennis | Simon A. Roscoe, Jr. |
| Robert N. England | Delbert A. Sexton |
| Walter H. Fehrs | Raymond L. Smith |
| James P. Forgy | Peter P. Vispo |
| Benjamin W. Gerrald | Floyd H. Whitehorn |

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification engineering, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

| | |
|---------------------------|----------------------|
| Willie G. Almand | Robert E. Murphy |
| Leo F. Armstrong | Harold B. O'Connor |
| Alfred J. Billings | James A. Pardo |
| James J. Brown | Robert G. Patterson |
| Leroy Bryant | Emile J. Racek |
| Gustav F. Builder | Robert S. Repta |
| Milton N. Cohen | Harry M. Rutherford |
| Thomas E. Condron | Elmer E. Salo |
| Ira B. Dement | Robert P. Schmidt |
| James M. Donley | Herbert "H" Scranton |
| Edward J. Farrell | Hubert E. Seward |
| Homer L. Ford, Jr. | Darryl D. Skow |
| Robert B. Goodman | Bruce L. Slawson |
| Lawrence C. Gore | Bryce D. Slawson |
| Carmano J. Gulli | George O. Smith |
| William J. Hipp | Homer R. Spann |
| Howard W. Hughes | Michael A. Staats |
| Alden M. Hutchinson | Leo H. Sweeney |
| Norman C. Johnson | Glynn A. Waldrop |
| William J. Landroche, Jr. | James W. Watts |
| | Ralph W. Welch |
| Gerald D. McCarthy | Henry W. Whittle |
| Donald H. Millon | Martin F. Zdolsek |
| James J. Murphy, Jr. | |

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification hull, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

| | |
|------------------|--------------------|
| Milfred C. Berg | Edward C. McConkey |
| Albert P. Festag | Ralph Motika |
| Gene Lanham | Eugene J. Schuster |

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification electronics, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Raymond W. Ash-Edgar L. James

| | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Lee E. Barret, Jr. | Michael J. Judge |
| Charles LeG. Benjamin | Edward J. Kasnicki |
| Arthur LeV. Bentley | Louis A. Kilpatrick |
| James T. Boyle | Herman LeR. Kinsel |
| James W. Brooks | Donald J. Kreutzberger |
| Bruce F. Brown | Henry E. Loudermilk |
| Howard E. Bylund | Richard C. McAllister |
| Walter A. Cahill | James L. McGlamery |
| Allyn C. Christopher | Paul F. Mademann |
| Bernard F. Clausen | Irving C. Nielsen |
| James E. Crickey, Jr. | William J. O'Halloran |
| Thomas P. David | Gilbert A. O'Rear |
| George E. Davis | Howard L. Palmer |
| Robert R. Dunn | Frank B. Scarlett |
| Jack D. Durham | Donald D. Shelton |
| Robert N. Elfsten | Jack W. Waddell |
| John R. Griffin | Theodore R. Weatherby |
| Bruce C. Haddan | Norman P. West |
| James L. Haning | Charles R. Witherpoon |
| Thomas W. Heffernon | |

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification aviation operations, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

| |
|----------------------|
| George W. Crowe |
| Llewellyn LeR. Naddy |
| James I. Pardue |

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification aviation ordnance, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

| | |
|-------------------|-----------------------|
| George F. Blehl | John C. McIlwaine |
| John E. Campbell | Edward R. Mateer, Jr. |
| Duane J. Counsell | |

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification aviation maintenance, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

| | |
|--------------------|---------------------|
| Robert V. Dawe | Charles Nuanes |
| John J. Erickson | John H. Richter |
| Charles E. Farrar | Milton W. Schreck |
| Clyde W. Holland | William J. Stephens |
| Charles E. Johnson | James R. Vannice |
| Edward M. Nowak | Bryce K. Worrock |

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification aerology, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

| |
|---------------------|
| Claude C. Brown |
| Richard C. Husted |
| Stanley W. Stanwick |

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification aviation electronics, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

| | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Robert C. Borden, Jr. | Calvin H. Lyle |
| Jack R. Carpenter | William Maliczowski |
| Elmer S. Clark, Jr. | Robert L. Miller, Jr. |
| Jay R. Collins | Ashley A. Myers |
| Daniel Curran | Odis A. Nicholson |
| Bernard C. Elliott | Henry B. Perry |
| George R. Fromm | Jesse W. Quisenberry |
| Frederick W. Glaeser | John C. Roach |
| William J. Keith | William P. Yarbrough, Jr. |
| William P. Koll | |

The following-named to be ensigns in the Supply Corps in the Navy, for limited duty only, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

| | |
|--------------------------|--------------------|
| Harry Blackwell, Jr. | Lloyd W. Krueger |
| Walter E. Buck, Jr. | Jamie R. Murphy |
| George J. Cooney | Robert H. O'Malley |
| Russell S. Dohmeyer | Harold S. Parr |
| James F. Erskine | Joseph R. Riser |
| Wallace J. Hanna | Jettie C. Shuler |
| James J. Hart, Jr. | James Thompson |
| Harold S. Hatcher | Blaxton V. Todd |
| Horald McR. Hughes | Charles A. Vedra |
| Billy N. Jones | Frank J. Wolfe |
| Diedrich K. Kriete-meyer | Joseph M. Zepczyk |

The following-named to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps in the Navy, for limited duty only, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

| | |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| Lee S. Brooks | Victor H. Kimmons |
| Robert E. Kenny | Joseph F. Young |

The following-named (Naval Academy graduates) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Don E. Aitchison | Raymond M. Kotesky |
| Ronald L. Amon | Robert S. Lamb |
| Charles T. Andrews | John L. Landis |
| William C. Auer, Jr. | Franklin J. Lewis |
| Harry F. Barnes | Darwin D. Lundberg |
| Ronald G. Beagle | Jarvis D. Lynch, Jr. |
| Richard G. Braun | Daniel R. McGrath |
| James C. Brokaw | Shamyl C. Massey |
| Robert S. Brown, Jr. | Robert F. Milligan |
| William C. Bullis | Charles L. Monson, Jr. |
| Forrest W. Crone | Robert T. Motherway |
| Timothy J. Cronin, Jr. | James B. Murtland III |
| William C. Doerner | Cornelius J. O'Shea |
| Donald M. Douglas | Clarence R. Perry |
| Thomas R. Edgar | Keith E. Phillips |
| John J. Egan | Louis G. Sasso |
| Alex E. Fazekas | William M. Schoessel, Jr. |
| Pat D. Ford | Richard T. Shigley |
| Carroll R. Franklin | James S. Shillinglaw |
| Albert L. Granger | John Smallman |
| Roy M. Gulick, Jr. | James W. Smith |
| Milledge A. Hart III | Daniel L. Sullivan |
| Richard T. Henry | Theodore W. Taylor |
| Dale C. Herndon | Anthony Trent |
| John I. Hopkins | Richard S. Varney |
| Don E. Kennedy | Cloyd H. Klingensmith |
| Wayne M. Willis | Charles E. Knetties |
| Joseph B. Wuertz | |

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

| | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Dennis P. Abrahamson | Roger T. Castonguay |
| Robert T. Adams | Harian P. Chapman |
| James D. Alton, Jr. | James L. Clapp |
| Kenneth F. Anderson | Dale H. Clark |
| Neil P. Anderson | Carl A. Clay |
| William D. Andrews | Westray S. Cobb |
| Harold L. Angle | Fred J. Cone |
| Richard K. Apple | Charles G. Conway |
| Keith E. Austin | Robert M. Cook |
| George M. Ball | James C. Cooley |
| Leonard S. Baranski | John R. Dailey |
| Richard H. Barnhardt | Thomas F. Davenport, Jr. |
| Victor M. Barr | Elden R. Davisson |
| John E. Bates | Jerry A. Dick |
| Norbert J. Beckman | Larry L. Dier |
| John P. Beggins | Wade D. Dorland |
| Dan A. Bench | William P. Dowling |
| James W. Benson | Terry L. Eikenberry |
| Robert F. Bickel | John S. Evans |
| Charles E. Billips | Hans M. Ewoldsen |
| Ben C. Blasingame | James E. Felker |
| James M. Boswell | Charles R. Ferree |
| Daniel D. Booklund | Robert L. Formanek |
| James C. Boggs, Jr. | Otis F. Forsyth |
| William E. Bower | Clifford G. Fox |
| Loren A. Brandt | Peter D. Francis |
| Bruce L. Brown | Armin H. Frank |
| Arnold J. Bur | Ray M. Franklin |
| John C. Burger | Donald R. Fraser |
| Phillip R. Burnaman | Joseph A. Frasier III |
| Robert G. Burnham | Franklin D. Burroughs |
| John D. Friske | Irving L. Fuller, Jr. |
| Richard W. Calfee | Donald A. Gazzaniga |
| Theodore E. Calleton | Donald P. Geddes, Jr. |
| James T. Callier, Jr. | William G. Giles |
| Richard G. Camacho | Thomas E. Gillespie, Jr. |
| Joseph G. Campbell | Earle P. Gillette, Jr. |
| | Thaxter L. Goodell |
| Floyd E. Cannon | John C. Goodman |
| Vincent A. Carbonar | William T. Graham |
| John D. Carlton | John L. Griffin |
| Harry D. Carroll, Jr. | George F. Hager, Jr. |
| Raymond L. Carroll | |
| Jared G. Carter | |

George S. Hamilton
John K. Hammes
John R. Harman
Peter C. Harrity
James B. Hart
Francis M. Hayden
Phillip M. Haymond
John W. Henry, Jr.
John M. Hey
Dean C. Hickox
William R. Hinds
Russell E. Hoffman
William G. Holiday
Lee B. Holmes
Kenneth R. Hook
Peter F. Hovell
Delbert J. Howerton
Guy D. Hughes
Richard D. Hughes, Jr.
Charles J. Hurbis
William D. Jackson
Walter M. Jastrzemski
Bruce W. Johnson
Gordon E. Johnson III
Paul D. Jones
James J. Kent
Paul D. King, Jr.
Ben Kingree III
Joseph A. Kish
George W. Kisker
Eugene J. Klosak
Eugene W. Knobloch
Clement J. Koehler
Alan R. Kosmata
Aaron Kraemer
Ernest R. Kugler
Ludwig G. Kuttner
Jovite Labonte, Jr.
James H. Lane
John F. Laue
Richard J. Lawrence
Bobby A. Lay
Clark M. Leonard
Ronald R. Lethin
John S. Llewellyn, Jr.
Arthur P. Loring
James F. Lowrie
Bruce D. Luedke
Robert Lugannani
Edmund M. Lutes, Jr.
Bruce G. Lynch
John L. MacFarlane
Robert T. Maddox
Earl S. Maeser
John A. Manke
David L. Marble
John T. Marshall
Robert S. Martin, Jr.
Gerald J. Massey
James L. Massey
Harris E. Matthews
Josephus L. Mavretic
Robert J. McAllister
Peter F. McCloskey
George M. McClure
Dudley E. McFadden, Jr.
Jack E. McGregor
Edward P. McManus
Theodore R. McMillin, Jr.
John J. McPhillips
Leon G. Mears
Joseph B. Meiners, Jr.
George F. Meister, Jr.
Howard I. Melton, Jr.
James P. Menton
David A. Merline
Michael Miller
Robert R. Mills, Jr.
Frederick J. Moe
Wesley N. Mollard
William B. Moore
James C. Moreton
Richard C. Movich
Robert G. Munro
Dewey L. Newman
James S. Nist
Richard J. O'Brien

Don J. Ogden
James P. O'Malley
Carl D. Orlo
James W. Orr
John K. Palmer
Delos S. Pappas
Blaine R. Park
Charles F. Parke
Richard A. Patterson
Theodore R. Paulson, Jr.
Richard K. Penland
Dayle M. Perkins
Richard I. Peterson
Adolph J. Poche, Jr.
Charles R. Porter
Leonard E. Porter
Floyd T. Pottratz
Robert A. Powers
David T. Pratt
George S. Prescott
Robert N. Rackham
George D. Raitt
James P. Reed
Frank C. Regan
Frank M. Reinecke, Jr.
Milton A. Reinke
James F. Rice
James L. Roach
Jack J. Rogers
John E. Rogler
Carl A. Rohloff
William B. Rourke, Jr.
Eugene B. Russell
Edward F. Ryan
Robert W. Rycklik
Joe P. Sanders
Robert A. Sargeant
Donald E. Schaet
William A. Schaffer
William A. Schoen
Rolf R. Schroeder
Philip A. Schweri
Henry L. Searle
Lawrence D. Sheridan
William H. Shirley
Francis Sistrunk
Phillip G. Slough
Donald A. Smith
Carl Solomonson, Jr.
Charles J. Sonnen II
Richard H. Stableford
Gerald F. Staleton
Michael E. Stein
Benton E. Stephenson, Jr.
Edward E. Stith
Rodney L. Stone
Walter A. Suhre, Jr.
John A. Sullivan
Haskell H. Sumrall, Jr.
M. Ronald Svec
James E. Swab
William J. Swartz
Carter P. Swenson
Ronald E. Tatum
Edward F. Toben, Jr.
Franklin J. Tonini
Edward F. Townley, Jr.
James B. Townsend
Paul G. Toxle
Raymond C. Treat
Donald R. Treicher
Robert H. True
Thomas J. Tully
Jan H. Vangorder
Neil R. VanLeeuwen
Richard J. Vesely
Walter L. Wagenhals
Robert C. Wagner, Jr.
Jay B. Weldler, Jr.
Wayne C. Weld
James P. Williams
John C. Williams III
Robert W. Williams
Anthony M. Wynn
Melvin B. Young III

The following-named (Army Reserve Officers Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Nicholas J. Adamo
George H. Brower
William R. Hopkins

Edmund W. Kaaa, Jr.
William M. Westerman

The following-named Reserve officers for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Arthur Bergman
Howard A. Christy
Phillip E. Clemente
Ervin J. Crampton
George J. Higginbotham
Billy J. Kahler
Benjamin E. Macha
Robert C. Maher
Carl B. McGuire
Jimmy B. McInroe

Warren L. Melchert
David L. Odom
George E. Peterson
Stanton H. Roberts, Jr.
John B. Schafer
Sylvester D. Smaldone
Richard G. Steffey
Arthur L. Stewart, Jr.
Marvin V. Uthe
Gerald E. Vorrhees
William W. Widener

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Jack B. Aldridge
David N. Duncan
Winifred F. Welch

The following-named officer for temporary appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Dennis M. Cantrell

The following-named officer from the temporary disability retired list for permanent appointment to the grade of captain in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Norman H. Bryant

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Luther Palmer Bean, Clanton, Ala., in place of R. W. Lowe, retired.
Winston S. Morris, Elkmont, Ala., in place of J. T. Evans, transferred.

ALASKA

Michael Shepard, Anchorage, Alaska, in place of H. E. Brown, retired.

ARIZONA

William F. Cole, Maricopa, Ariz., in place of E. B. Green, retired.
Sarah L. Smith, Randolph, Ariz., in place of M. H. Smith, deceased.

ARKANSAS

Boyd B. Hamner, Bradley, Ark., in place of T. S. Reynolds, retired.
Harry Craig, Jonesboro, Ark., in place of F. R. Parr, retired.
Willis E. Varvil, Quitman, Ark., in place of J. O. Woolly, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Laura J. Pawlus, Bridgeville, Calif., in place of G. H. Cox, retired.
Virginia N. Sharp, Esparto, Calif., in place of L. K. Murray, resigned.
Noma Joyce Marshall, Five Points, Calif., in place of O. L. Smith, resigned.
James E. Orr, Lancaster, Calif., in place of L. P. White, transferred.
Charles F. Linck, Ja., Ontario, Calif., in place of C. J. Hase, removed.
Raymond C. Durant, Redondo Beach, Calif., in place of A. M. Schaeffer, declined.

CONNECTICUT

Richard J. Brereton, Wilton, Conn., in place of J. J. Cahill, resigned.

DELAWARE

Mark T. Berryman, Seaford, Del., in place of J. H. Cox, removed.

FLORIDA

Troy K. Smith, Bowling Green, Fla., in place of H. H. Bryan, retired.
L. M. Galloway, Eustis, Fla., in place of A. O. Jefferis, deceased.
William O. Kennedy, Inverness, Fla., in place of J. S. Savary, deceased.

GEORGIA

William C. Chambers, Jr., Fort Gaines, Ga., in place of J. G. Scaife, deceased.
Samuel H. Henderson, Gray, Ga., in place of U. S. Lancaster, retired.
Carlos M. Sisson, Hapeville, Ga., in place of M. F. Smith, transferred.
William A. Garner, Ray City, Ga., in place of G. L. Webb, removed.

HAWAII

Joe R. Ferreria, Hanamaulu, Hawaii, in place of Antone Nobriga, Jr., retired.

ILLINOIS

Walter B. Tregoning, Carterville, Ill., in place of F. J. Rudloff, removed.
Wilburn R. Spencer, Murrayville, Ill., in place of Nellie Waters, retired.
Alfred E. Leininger, Nauvoo, Ill., in place of P. H. Schenk, removed.
Oliva S. Bradford, Table Grove, Ill., in place of Ruby Maxwell, resigned.

INDIANA

Otto L. Groninger, Akron, Ind., in place of D. L. Slaybaugh, retired.
Robert L. Sieber, Delphi, Ind., in place of W. B. Popejoy, transferred.
Charles F. Hasnerl, Knox, Ind., in place of C. W. Cannon, retired.
Ned Warner, Osceola, Ind., in place of E. T. Jansen, resigned.
Wendell R. Martin, Rensselaer, Ind., in place of H. E. McMahan, resigned.
Alfred L. Howe, Star City, Ind., in place of H. L. Korner, retired.
John D. Gaston, Urbana, Ind., in place of A. O. Hipskind, resigned.
Wilfred E. Shoemaker, Yorktown, Ind., in place of C. E. Jones, retired.

IOWA

Ray H. Aten, Humeston, Iowa, in place of R. W. Gardner, removed.
Charles R. Kremenak, Newell, Iowa, in place of D. N. Layman, retired.

KANSAS

Ralyn M. Hill, Abilene, Kans., in place of J. B. Robson, removed.
Warren L. Hartley, Belle Plaine, Kans., in place of G. L. Savage, resigned.
Myrtle M. McNeive, Emmett, Kans., in place of C. M. Moylan, retired.
Layne B. Lairmore, Newton, Kans., in place of W. F. Decker, deceased.
Bertha I. Elniff, Randall, Kans., in place of R. E. Collier, retired.
Merle E. Popplewell, South Haven, Kans., in place of H. F. Dodson, retired.

KENTUCKY

John D. Miller, Valley Station, Ky., in place of Murray Swindler, retired.

LOUISIANA

Claude Rogers, Saline, La., in place of W. S. Montgomery, retired.

MAINE

Pauline C. Nason, Poland, Maine, in place of E. J. Johnson, retired.

MARYLAND

Beatrice P. Brittingham, Fishing Creek, Md., in place of L. W. Tyler, declined.
Edward F. Boston, Princess Anne, Md., in place of J. E. Morris, retired.
Hugh H. Hassell, Rockville, Md., in place of H. A. Dawson, retired.
Rayola M. Moore, White Marsh, Md., in place of A. A. Kellner, resigned.

MASSACHUSETTS

Ernest A. Paradis, Dodgeville, Mass., in place of J. E. Langlois, deceased.

Larz D. Neilson, North Wilmington, Mass., in place of A. E. Gallagher, retired.
Cecil H. Evans, West Hanover, Mass., in place of P. J. Hanberry, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Donald H. Hutchins, Glenn, Mich., in place of G. M. Gerstner, resigned.
Mason Holmes, Idlewild, Mich., in place of M. A. Porter, removed.
Gordon H. Buckner, St. Clair, Mich., in place of J. C. Chamberlin, retired.
Alice R. Cox, Willis, Mich., in place of G. D. Howell, transferred.

MINNESOTA

Loren J. Schendel, Saint Michael, Minn., in place of C. E. Bloms, deceased.

MISSISSIPPI

Allie Mack Coker, Brookhaven, Miss., in place of Troy McGehee, retired.
Reece L. Cupit, Columbia, Miss., in place of D. W. Colbert, transferred.
Harvey C. Mitchell, Jr., Plantersville, Miss., in place of W. T. Grant, transferred.
Minnie L. Logan, Tinsley, Miss., in place of D. C. Selby, retired.

MISSOURI

Robert E. Hock, Fort Leonard Wood, Mo., in place of A. L. York, removed.
Wilma M. Henneke, Leslie, Mo., in place of G. C. Henneke, deceased.
Davis L. Owen, Moberly, Mo., in place of P. K. Weis, retired.
James W. Buzzard, Seneca, Mo., in place of H. B. Anderson, removed.

MONTANA

George W. Duffy, Whitefish, Mont., in place of L. E. Whitmore, retired.
William B. McCracken, Wolf Point, Mont., in place of L. R. Johnson, resigned.

NEBRASKA

Earnest A. Moxham, Chester, Nebr., in place of W. C. Rhea, retired.
Dale B. Morrill, Creighton, Nebr., in place of W. A. Horstman, removed.
Lowell L. Saunders, Dixon, Nebr., in place of H. L. Balser, retired.
Gilbert R. Fletcher, Hoskins, Nebr., in place of E. F. Winter, resigned.
Albert W. Watsek, Humboldt, Nebr., in place of Charles Hynek, deceased.
Alvin O. Jones, Sutherland, Nebr., in place of J. M. McKinley, removed.
Leland D. Dewitz, Wisner, Nebr., in place of W. M. Gross, removed.

NEVADA

Minnie Kennedy Tuxill, Glenbrook, Nev., in place of Frank Schneider, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Ives Atherton, Hanover, N. H., in place of J. S. Gould, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Harry H. Pedersen, Jr., Absecon, N. J., in place of C. S. Giberson, removed.
George W. Douglass, Cape May Court House, N. J., in place of Preston Fisher, retired.
Gertrude N. Bailey, Dividing Creek, N. J., in place of J. R. Hendricks, removed.
Howard F. Koons, Perth Amboy, N. J., in place of J. J. Quinn, retired.
John J. Picknally, Jr., Sea Bright, N. J., in place of J. L. Garland, resigned.

NEW YORK

Maurice W. Keating, Beacon, N. Y., in place of E. B. Murphy, retired.
Doris M. Robinson, Comstock, N. Y., in place of T. C. Sullivan, retired.
Alice M. Bird, Lake Peekskill, N. Y., in place of Zenobia Carrara, retired.
William R. Costello, Red House, N. Y., in place of Nevil France, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Nelwyn F. Carawan, Bridgeton, N. C., in place of R. J. Weisiger, retired.

OHIO

Glenn M. Price, Gahanna, Ohio, in place of H. C. Reisdorf, resigned.
Ann M. Collins, Hooven, Ohio, in place of L. F. Hayes, retired.
Clarence J. Loch, Salineville, Ohio, in place of M. F. Mulheran, retired.
Victor Ferrari, Sr., Smithfield, Ohio, in place of C. A. Flenniken, removed.
Janice B. Hilborn, Tiro, Ohio, in place of J. L. Snyder, retired.
Nolen E. Stuckey, Van Wert, Ohio, in place of J. I. Miller, retired.
Richard G. Graham, Wapakoneta, Ohio, in place of A. J. Brown, retired.
Owen F. Hartsock, Waynesville, Ohio, in place of E. W. Conner, resigned.
Stephen M. Snouffer, Worthington, Ohio, in place of H. B. Lindimore, retired.

OKLAHOMA

William A. Craig, Miami, Okla., in place of Roy McGhee, removed.
Glen L. Strange, Tonkawa, Okla., in place of H. J. Barclay, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Robert W. Newton, Blandburg, Pa., in place of A. R. Lovell, retired.
Adrian E. Kibler, Hastings, Pa., in place of P. O. Holtz, retired.
Mary E. Yost, Loganville, Pa., in place of H. P. Shue, deceased.
Norbert C. McDermott, McKees Rocks, Pa., in place of L. A. Donahoe, deceased.
Drue L. Eyer, Nescopeck, Pa., in place of L. A. Parr, retired.
Melvin S. Raudabaugh, New Kingstown, Pa., in place of S. V. Martin, resigned.
Alfred E. Ingram, Norwood, Pa., in place of R. B. Mushler, removed.
Robert D. Esbenschade, Paradise, Pa., in place of S. T. Hershey, retired.
Howard J. Short, Willow Grove, Pa., in place of H. T. McEvoy, removed.
Jack S. Karchner, Woodland, Pa., in place of F. B. Maines, retired.
Samuel P. Zangari, Wrightsville, Pa., in place of M. E. Reisinger, retired.

PUERTO RICO

Euclides Pagan Irizarry, Aquadilla, P. R., in place of Antonio Esteves, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Manly D. Padgett, Edgefield, S. C., in place of J. G. Holland, retired.

TENNESSEE

Josiah A. DeMarcus, Norris, Tenn., in place of R. Q. Williams, deceased.
Ross C. Hopkins, Sneedville, Tenn., in place of C. M. Seal, resigned.

TEXAS

Ponder A. Pickett, Big Wells, Tex., in place of S. A. Armstrong, resigned.
Ernest A. Mullen, Florence, Tex., in place of W. H. Taylor, deceased.
Melvin J. Nagel, Mathis, Tex., in place of N. G. Magowan, retired.
Annie M. Ramsey, Point Comfort, Tex., established January 1, 1955.
Jean F. Walker, Sheridan, Tex., in place of L. A. Botard, removed.
Dewey E. Waggoner, Sundown, Tex., in place of E. F. Oden, resigned.

UTAH

Garnel E. Larsen, Hyrum, Utah, in place of M. R. Liljenquist, retired.
Gordon A. Wood, Monticello, Utah, in place of A. B. Barton, retired.

VERMONT

John William Laramie, North Springfield, Vt., in place of E. J. Chapman, deceased.

VIRGINIA

Charles William Brown, Narrows, Va., in place of H. W. Hale, Jr., transferred.
Raymond N. Kinder, Rural Retreat, Va., in place of F. P. Brown, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Arlow R. Evers, Electric City, Wash., in place of W. M. Ratliff, resigned.
Lawrence G. Luzader, Pe Ell, Wash., in place of H. M. Walker, deceased.
James T. Likes, Rosalia, Wash., in place of H. C. Roberts, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Anna Jean Duncan, Cannelton, W. Va., in place of Roy Palmer, resigned.
Evelyn Wolford, Edgerton, W. Va., in place of L. J. Weaver, resigned.
Johnston Winston Chapman, Montgomery, W. Va., in place of Michael Kandel, transferred.
Leon D. Rishel, Spencer, W. Va., in place of W. H. Miller, transferred.
Erma J. Compton, Volga, W. Va., in place of A. C. Lambert, deceased.

WISCONSIN

Bernice A. Bechard, Bear Creek, Wis., in place of Frank W. Flanagan, retired.
Lawrence W. Paul, Fox Lake, Wis., in place of L. L. Dinkel, transferred.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 9, 1956.

POSTMASTER

Lewis R. Knox to be postmaster at Helena, in the State of Montana.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 9, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 226.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, by whose mercies we are spared and by whose power we are sustained, we thank Thee for Thy protecting care over us during the Easter recess.

Grant that our Speaker and the Members of the Congress may now be abundantly blessed with renewed strength and wisdom as they again turn to their high vocation and the particular business of statecraft.

May we daily feel that it is Thy work in which we are engaged and may it be the goal of all our aspirations and endeavors to be faithful stewards of Thy manifold grace and obedient servants of Thy holy will.

Help us never to interpret the reality and value of life merely in terms of its duration but always by its devotion and consecration to lofty principles and our donations and contributions to the welfare and happiness of all mankind.

To Thy name we ascribe all the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 29, 1956, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and